

TRUTH *and* LIBERTY
Consistent and Maintain'd:

Being a farther

DEFENCE

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

ASSEMBLY at EXON:

IN

ANSWER to Mr. PEIRCE.

Wherein the Reader will find obviated, what-
ever is Material in certain *Propositions*, in an
Anonymous Letter to Mr. JOHN ENTY.

By JOHN ENTY. *K*

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible and
Crown in the Poultry near Cheapside.

M, DDC, XX.

Price Two Shillings,

TRUTH and LIBERTY
Consistent and Maintained:

Being a further

DEFENCE

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS



ASSEMBLED IN EXON.

IN

ANSWER to MR. PIERCE.

Wherein the Reader will find obtained, what
ever is Material in certain Propositions, in an
Anonymous Letter to Mr. JOHN EMTY.

By JOHN EMTY.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible and
Crown in the Parity near Chichester.

M DCC. XX.

Price Two Shillings.



TRUTH and LIBERTY, consistent and maintain'd, &c.

I AM fully persuaded, (whatever Strangers may think of Mr. P.) that all that know any thing of his *Conduct*, are sensible by this time, that 'tis owing chiefly to him, that there have been such unhappy *Contentions* among us in these Parts; And that the more he writes, the more he'll convince the World that it is so. He doth not now stick to own, that he hath been in the new *Scheme* for several Years. * And tho' he hath been less upon the *Reserve*, since the Assembly thought fit to interpose in the Affair; Yet 'tis observable, that there is scarce any thing that he hath publish'd of his *new Notions*, but his Admirers, (however they came to be acquainted with them) could boast of as *his Opinions* long before 'Twas Mr. P.'s Reputation that made many *fond* of these *Conceits*; and the Prospect, if not the Assurance of his *Patronage*, that made many bold, and open in declaring themselves. And therefore, that Mr. P.'s *Votaries* should kindle such a *Ferment*, and he himself be altogether *passive* in this Matter, is what none will easily believe; and especially, when it shall be seen, (as I hope it will in due time) how

* Western Inquisition. p. 8, 9, 10.

little *Truth* there is in a great many of those *Facts* that are related in his *Western Inquisition*.

I am concern'd, that a Person of Mr. P.'s Character, should attempt to pass such things upon the World, and transmit them to Posterity, as things that must justify himself, and others, without a more careful Examination. If he did know the *Facts* to be false, or did not know them to be true, as he could not; He should have suspended their *Publication*, and endeavour'd to justify himself some other Way. 'Tis from these *Facts*, I suppose, that are many of them without the least *Foundation*, that Mr. P. expects, that the World should pass *Sentence* in his Favour: But, if ever these things are set in a just Light, (which is a *Debt* due to *Posterity*, as well as the present *Generation*) they will be found to do him no Kindness; but will abundantly satisfy the World, that if ever the *Assembly* would do any thing for *Religion*, 'twas necessary they should act the part they did: and that if they are to be blam'd, 'tis not because they appear'd too soon, but no sooner.

I have attempted to justify what the Assembly did; and can't help it, if my *Performance* is such a sorry Thing as Mr. P. represents it. p. 91. 'Tis an Advantage, that Mr. P. hath such feeble *Adversaries* as my self, and others: But whether his Friends will forgive him, that he still goes on to fight with *Shadows*, I can't say. However, 'tis hardly pardonable, if what I have said be so little to the *Purpose*, that Mr. P. should give it so long and so solemn a *Confutation*. Either, he hath no reason to blame me so often for using many Words; or else, he hath reason to blame himself, that he should swell an *Answer* into an 105 Pages, to what according to him, might lye in a very narrow Compass: And especially, when at this length, 'tis only an Answer to what he thinks to be Material. If he
could

could not do this with more *Brevity*, when several, of as important Things as any I have said are wholly neglected, I hope, he'll the more easily forgive my Tedioufness, or condemn his own. I should be loth to tire the World with my *Writings*, and shall be peculiarly careful, that I don't do it, by *rendring Evil for Evil, and Railing for Railing*: And more especially, when what I do, is for the *Honour* of him, *who when he was reviled, reviled not again*. I can assure Mr. P. with Pleasure, that the World hath too much *Sense*, or too much good *Humour*, to relish such *Severities* as appear in his *Writings*. And therefore, if he would have any *Compassion* on his own *Reputation*, as a Friend I advise him, either to write less, or to write with more *Temper*.

I can't see that 'twould be of any great Service that the World should know, whether Mr. P. or I, have the best *Temper*. For my own part, I most earnestly wish, that I had more of the meek and humble *Temper* of my great *Master*. I am not sensible, that 'twas any Fault to take Notice with *Thankfulness* as I did of my *Circumstances*, when necessary to purge my self from the Suspicion of a Fault that was charg'd upon me. Whatever my *Circumstances* or *Spirit* be, I don't use to treat Persons as Mr. P. hath treated me, and others. Nor will it, I hope, be thought vain, to say, that Mr. P. hath taken up a *Reproach* against me, as well as many others, without Cause; and if I guess right, from those, whose Words are no great Scandal among those that know them. I leave it with him to consider, whether it be just, to treat any Person thus that he doth not know, as he says he does not me. If Mr. P. had known nothing of my *Temper*, he should, I think, have said nothing, and much less publish'd such a *reproachful Insinuation* as p. 4. without any Ground, and against *Truth*.

To say as little as possible upon this Subject, it won't, I suppose, be thought a Sign of the worst *Temper* in me, that there is now, and hath been for a great many Years, so much *Harmony* and *Peace* there, where before, for a long Time, there was not a little *Disorder* and *Confusion*. And that not only my particular Friends, but the *Town* in general, (for which I here return them my publick Thanks) are loth to part with me. Nor will it, I presume, be thought a Sign of the best *Temper* in Mr. P. that there is now so much *Heat* and *Animosity* in a CITY, where every thing was cool, and calm, and most harmonious before his coming. But however peaceable, humble, and obliging, Mr. P.'s private Conduct may have been, and however forward he may have been to good Offices, &c. this won't excuse either his writing so much, or with such a peculiar *Warmth*, and *Bitterness* of Language. This *Temper* of his, (which is what I had my Eye upon) is what most others blame as well as I. And yet, as there was no Occasion, so I don't know that I take any Advantage of it, to put by any Charges that are brought against my self or Friends. I think, I have fairly consider'd what Mr. P. offers against the Assembly; And if I han't discover'd such a *Genius* in my *Defence*, as Mr. P. hath in his *Remarks*; yet the World, I believe, will own, that I have discover'd more *Civility* and *Temper*; and I hope, I have made my self no Enemies by my Writings, or yet given Offence. And, whatever Mr. P. may suggest to the contrary, I have also ever endeavour'd to be tender of Mens Characters, and especially of that of *Ministers*; as sensible of the Moment of a good Reputation to do Service.

It looks very uncharitable, in one that pretends to Charity so much as Mr. P. and blames others so much for the want of it, to insinuate as p. 5, that
our

our chief Design was to promote *Heats, Animosities, and Uncharitableness*: A little Charity might have led him to other Apprehensions. And tho' he pretends, this is all the Success we can boast of: yet I can't forbear thinking, (whatever Mr. P. may imagine) that the *Stand* the Assembly made against *Arianism*, hath done great Service. It hath much quieted the Minds of many among our selves: It hath taken off much of that *Prejudice*, that many on the account of the Growth of Error had conceiv'd against us: It hath convinc'd the World of our *Honesty* and *Integrity*; that we can no more excuse, what we take to be bad amongst our selves, than when we observe it in other Persons. And as it would have been much too mean and base, to have had any Views of ingratiating our selves with *Whigs* or *High-Church*, where the Honour of our Redeemer was so nearly concern'd; so I can't think, that we have disoblig'd our old Friends, unless those few, if there be any such, that may be more concern'd for *Liberty*, than they are for *Religion*; or who have the same Apprehensions of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* that Mr. P. hath.

'Tis possible, that there may be some of all *Parties* that have these Apprehensions. Our Concern, as an Assembly, was not to consider *State Policy*; and to balance the *Parties* that we have among us. 'Twas not a *State Doctrine* that we concern'd our selves about; and therefore not our Business to consider, who would be oblig'd or disoblig'd thereby. As *Christians* and *Divines*, we were to consider, how the great Truths of Religion might be secur'd: And in what we have done, I think, we have shewn our selves more the Servants of CHRIST, than if we had been studious to please Men. And yet, thro' the Goodness of GOD, it hath so happen'd, that we have pleas'd, as far as I can learn, the greatest part, both of *Whigs* and
High-

High-Church, that are serious, and concern'd for the Doctrines of Christianity. I don't know, that there was ever any Difference between these about the *Article* of the *Trinity*: In this Point, they have all along profess'd a strict Agreement: But if any on either side have chang'd their Sentiments now, 'tis unreasonable that they should expect, that we should give up our *Religion* on the Account of any ancient *Friendship*; And the more unreasonable still, when we have in our *Stations* been as much, or more Friends to them; than they have in their *Capacities* been to us: And I hope none will be offended, if I say, that should they expect, as I believe they don't, that we compliment them with our *Creed*, or *Consciences*, that we may have their Favour; they expect more than ever we can comply with, let the *Consequence* of it be what it will.

If any expect, we should give up this *Article* now, they may as well carry their Expectations farther in a little Time, and never stop, till we have given up all our *Religion*. Such Expectations as these we han't yet found, and I hope never shall; but can never dare to humour them if we should. For my own part, I can't see, why the *Whigs* should take any Offence at what we have done. If I know any thing of their *Principles* that can concern our present Controversy, 'tis that all should have a *Liberty* of serving GOD according to their *Consciences*. We are very willing that Persons should have this *Liberty*, and therefore han't deserv'd the *Censures* of the *Whigs* or *High Party*. We have persecuted none; We have impos'd on none, whatever popular Clamours there may be of this kind. We have done nothing to others, but what we are willing they should do to us. Nothing, but what we could satisfy our selves in the doing of, and what we thought necessary to be done in our

our present Circumstances. And if others, by reason of contrary *Notions* in Religion, can't go so far, we leave them to take their own Way: but as they'll take a Liberty, to shew their Dislike of what they think to be our *Errors*, so they must allow us to take the same Liberty: Nay, we may be more easily excus'd than they; because we take the things in *Controversy*, to be of much greater Importance than they seem to imagine.

I hope 'tis without Ground that Mr. P. says, p. 5, 6. "That 'tis visible that the Opinion we would check, gets Ground in spite of that Opposition." I am inform'd that he hath no reason to boast of this from the Increase of his own Congregation, tho' no Stone hath been left unturn'd that might promote it; and tho' he hath the Honour of being the *Head* of the *Party*: Nor do I know that it gets *Ground* in other Places among us, but rather the contrary. And yet, if the Opinion should get *Ground*, 'tis no more than many great Errors have done; those that Mr. P. can't but allow to be so, as well as I. In all Ages, (not excepting the Apostolical Times themselves) there have been many *giddy* and *unsettled* Persons; Persons of such a *catching Fancy*, as would presently fall into a *Fondness* for new Notions, especially if back'd with the *Credit* and *Authority* of considerable Names. Mr. P. can't but know, that there were hardly ever any Persons of *Note*, or *Boldness*, that appear'd in Defence of the worst Errors, but had many to follow their *pernicious Ways*, even *Simon Magus*, *Hymeneus*, *Philetus*, &c. And especially, when these Errors have been disguis'd, and the *Patrons* of them, tho' they differ as much from others, as Darkness from Light, and don't stick to own it to their own *Confidants*, shall yet speak in the same Language that others do; And particularly in this Case say, that our Saviour is

B truly

truly and properly GOD, &c. By such Language the unwary have been deluded, and brought perhaps to think hardly of those that have made a *Stand* against what they have been made to believe are only *Imaginary Errors*.

I am satisfy'd, Mr. P knows it as well as I, that there hath been a great deal of this *Art* us'd to keep the most *shocking* Part of the *New Scheme* from common View. If some honest Christians had been told plainly, that their great *Creator*, *Redeemer* and *Judge*, was no more than a *Creature*, (which I think is evidently the Error that is now broach'd:) If they had been plainly told, that our Glorious Saviour is not so perfect, but that he might have been more perfect; nor so high, but that he might have been much higher, if it had so pleas'd the Father: If they had been told, that he hath not such Power and Privileges, but that they might have been much greater; which in Consequence are the things that are advanc'd, and we oppose: These would have been too *Shocking* to be receiv'd by so many as are the Followers of Mr. P. &c. in these Parts; and yet, blessed be GOD, however it may be in other Places, they han't been able here by all their *Arts*, to make very many *Profelytes*; and for ought I see, their *Success* is at its full Height, at least I hope it is: Let this be as it will, I don't know that they have at present any great Reason to boast of their *Numbers*; and can't but think they would have less, if they had dealt as fairly and openly as others have done. I must believe that it is Fear of a *Desertion* that hath kept them and Mr. P. so much upon the *Reserve* till of late; and that they have chosen rather to propagate their Notions by spreading the dangerous *Pamphlets* written by others, than by speaking out themselves: I leave Mr. P to consider how suitable this is to the *Honesty* and *Fidelity*

lity of Gospel Ministers : If other Counties han't done as we have, I would hope, 'tis because they han't had that Occasion. But I have the Satisfaction however to let Mr. P. know, that tho' all may not applaud the *Assembly's Conduct*, as 'twas not reasonable to expect they should ; yet there are vast Numbers that do : And particularly I am told, that all the Ministers in the Kingdom of IRELAND, have lately shewn their Hearty and Unanimous Concurrence with us.

THERE is no need to add any thing more about the printing three *Lists* of Names ; but I do not understand what Mr. P. means, p. 6. " By claiming those that did not subscribe our Resolution " and Letter to be, in the Main, on their Side of " the Controversy ; and that they move no Controversy with us about the Trinity, but about Liberty." Mr. P. must know, that if he and others had gone as far as these Brethren do, it would have made us easy, and prevented all *Disputes* about Religion and Liberty too : That by doing what they did, they have entirely satisfy'd us concerning their Faith, and that we have nothing like Controversy with them that they went no farther ; nay, had they scrupled all Subscription to the Words of other Men, (which yet I don't see why any should, as long as they contain nothing but the Sense of Scripture, and a valuable End might be answer'd thereby) they might have given full Satisfaction in Words of their own : So that I think Mr. P. must be forc'd to quit his Claim to these Brethren ; and also his Pretence that our Controversy is about Liberty.

'Tis not any Invasion upon Liberty to oppose the Growth of Error, either by *Preaching*, *Writing*, or *Declaring* against it. 'Tis not any Breach upon Liberty for Brethren to satisfy one another, or to desire of one another, that they would satisfy

World concerning the *Soundness* of their *Faith*. Tis not any *Infringement* of *Liberty*, that we won't Encourage such to Officiate in the Church, as we apprehend will do more Hurt than Good: What *Liberty* it is that Mr. P. would have, I can't so well tell; unless that which would soon destroy all *Regular Worship, Discipline* and *Administrations* in the Church; and that he and his Brethren may make what *Profelytes* they can without Opposition: But as we can't justify our Conduct to God or the World, if we thus sit still and see others corrupting what we take to be the *Faith, Worship* and *Discipline* of the Gospel; so I think we shew ourselves to be sufficiently tender of the *Liberties* of Mankind, if we shew our Dislike of all *compulsive, sanguinary Methods*, and our Willingness to allow others the same *Liberty* that we desire our selves, viz. That they may be suffer'd to follow the *Light* and *Convictions* of their own Minds; and farther, that no one be debarr'd of any of his *Natural* and *Civil Rights* on the Account of Religion; unless his Notions be found to be dangerous to the *State*, as those of the *Papists* are: This is the *Liberty* we have always pleaded for; nor am I sensible, that we have by any one Step that we have taken, broken in upon it.

Mr. P. can't say but he hath *Liberty* to preach to such as will hear him; and tho' we can't, and dare not but shew our Dislike of the Notions he now owns, and endeavour to convince People of their hurtful Tendency; yet as this is all that we have done, so, if I know the Sentiments of others upon this Head as I do my own, as I believe I do, we shall never attempt to do more: This sufficiently shews our Regard to *Liberty*, and that whatever Mr. P. may suggest, the *Controversy* is not about this, but the *Trinity*. And I am surpriz'd that Mr. P. should offer to assert the contrary; when he knows,

knows, that if that which we take to be the true Doctrine of the *Trinity*, had not been oppos'd, there had been no *Controversy* at all : And whatever *Controversy* there is, I am verily perswaded 'twould immediately expire, could we agree as well in our Notions about the *Trinity*, as ~~disputing~~ about *Liberty* ; unless Mr. P. hath also a new Notion of *Liberty*, from what Protestant Dissenters have ever had.

Mr. P. allows, *p.* 6. that he hath not observ'd the *Rules of Kindness or common Decency* ; and verily poorly excuseth it, by pretending, " That we had first broke the Rules of Kindness with them, " and that we had been guilty of a Practice so " notoriously Evil, that it could not easily be " spoken of in softer Terms. " Unless Mr. P. had done more to convince the World, that we had been such notorious Offenders, I think it must be allow'd, that by going on to write after this *Rate*, he hath excus'd one Fault with another. I had hoped indeed, that what he wrote in a *Heat*, he would have retracted in his cooler Thoughts ; but I find, that as 'tis too much to expect from the Wisdom of some to own their *Mistakes* ; so from the *Humility* of others, to acknowledge these things to be Faults in themselves ; which are allow'd to be so in all other Men.

Mr. P. I observe, in examining my Heap of *Scandal*, as I very justly call it, doth not offer one Word to acquit himself of what I thought to be his *Design*, viz. To render the *Subscribers* odious and useless, and to blast and sink their Reputation : From this, I think, I may very fairly conclude that 'twas his *Design*, and accordingly, that all the *Satyr* that he spends so freely upon this Head, tho' it doth not in the least affect the Assembly, doth fall with Severity upon himself ; who tacitly owns, that this was the very thing he had in View : He tells us, *p.* 7. " 'Tis no Pleasure to him to reflect
" on

" on a Body of Ministers. " I wonder therefore the more, that he should put himself to Pain without Cause, and against Charity. I believe indeed, that an angry Man can have no great Satisfaction in throwing Firebrands, Arrows and Death ; and yet we find he often doth it. I agree with Mr. P. that our *Characters* should not cover unjust Proceedings : However, for Religion's sake there should be some Regard had to them, when they are laudable and just ; as ours appear to be, notwithstanding all that Mr. P. hath said. I think also with Mr. P. " That the worst Mischief hath of-
 " ten been done to Religion by Ministers them-
 " selves. " These have often corrupted the *Doc-
 trines* of Christianity, and torn up the very *Foundations* of that Religion that they ought to defend ; This we thought to be our own Unhappiness, and was the great Thing that mov'd us to take the *Steps* we did : And if the *Assembly* had done any thing like this, I should have thought my self oblig'd to join with Mr. P. in exposing the *Practice* : but however should have taken care to do it in *civil Expressions* ; as knowing, that tho' hard Words may serve to inflame the *Passions*, where they are before prepar'd to receive these odd Impressions ; yet they add no *Weight* to the Argument with thinking Persons. I am ignorant that the Assembly have broken in upon any *Gospel Rule*, and can't help believing, that we are as hearty Friends to all the *Liberties* that Christians have a Right to claim, as Mr. P. can be.

WE have always been easy, as Mr. P. knows, that the different Persuasions of Christians should have all the *Indulgence* that the Law allows : Yea, we han't been uneasy, that those who are no Christians at all, should yet have a *Liberty* of serving GOD according to their Consciences : As far as this we can freely go, and no farther. And if this
 be

be not far enough, I would fain know on what Account it is, that *Dissenters* have always valu'd themselves upon their greater *Purity*, and having a better *Discipline* than others? Is it not, because upon our Principles, we can keep the *Ignorant*, *Erroneous* and *Wicked*, whether Ministers or People, from having that near Concern with Sacred Things in our own Societies, that others have? This Privilege is a Trust we can't betray, and if we should, we should soon be a ruin'd People, and the *Scorn* and *Contempt* of Mankind.

I shan't deny that Mr. P. as p. 7. may have a great Respect for many of the *Subscribers*, and I should very much wonder if he had not, when they are known to be Persons of undoubted Worth: But if, as he hath forborn to meddle with *Personal Characters*, he had forborn also those general and severe Accusations that affect all; and manifested his Respect by a more obliging Treatment; it would not only have rendred the Sincerity of his Respect less questionable, but could have done no Injury to the Cause of *Truth*, wherever it lies, whatever it might to his own Party; many of whom have dealt so very much in *Scandal*, as if they had no other way to support themselves, but by reproaching others.

'Tis not my Business to enquire into the Characters of those that differ from us; but if they had been a great deal better than they are, Mr. P. hath not yet convinc'd me, nor I believe the World, that the *Assembly* bore hard upon any: unless by bearing hard he means, that nothing ought to have been said against the *New Scheme*, or those *Books* that have been wrote in Defence of it. 'Tis new, I think, among the *Dissenters*, that their Appearance against what they take to be a most dangerous Error, should be call'd hard Usage: If this be a *Hardship*, 'tis such as our Office

Office doth oblige us to. And whereas we are upbraided by Mr. P. both here and in his *Western Inquisition*, with gentler Proceedings in other Cases; 'tis, to say the softest thing of the Charge, if I don't mistake the case, as I believe I don't, a most *causeless Calumny*: And I hope upon second Thoughts, Mr. P. himself will believe, that 'tis far from arguing the most *Christian* and *Candid Spirit*, to attempt the *Revival* of those things which have been so long buried, and ought for ever to be buried in *Oblivion*. A good Cause, I am sure, can never need to be serv'd by such a reproachful Method; a Method that can't have any other Tendency, than to expose Religion: And if it be true, as I am told, that Mr. P. himself did applaud our Proceedings; 'tis the more unaccountable that he should upbraid us now with too much Gentleness. Our Rule is, *to restore such as are overtaken in a Fault with a Spirit of Meekness*: And whenever we have had Occasion to act by this Rule, (as thro' the singular Goodness of God it hath been very rare) we have expected the Profession of a deep *Repentance*, and the Promise of a thorow *Reformation*; and this, as it hath been comply'd with, so I don't know that it hath been contradicted by an unsuitable Behaviour afterwards.

Mr. P. instead of denying that he hath given the Enemies of Religion occasion to triumph, only says, p. 7. "That the *Assembly* have given them the same Handle." This, if true, is a very sorry Excuse; but I can't be sensible, whatever Mr. P. may, that our *Proceedings* had any Tendency that Way; or that he hath done any thing to prevent their greater *Triumphs*. 'Tis undoubtedly no small Satisfaction to them, that there are such Differences among us, even about our Faith: But is it a likely way to prevent their greater Triumphs,

umphs, to represent us as *Imposers, Persecutors, Betrayers* of the *Liberties* of Mankind, as acted by a *Papish Spirit*, &c. and all this for no other reason, that I know of, but our steadfast Adherence to what we take to be the *Truths* of the Gospel, and acting as those that *are set for the Defence of it*? Mr. P. can't but know, that it hath been a most grateful Service to *Athiests* and *Infidels*, when Ministers have been thus severely handled: And therefore that which I blame him for is, that he did not consider things better, and oppose the *Assembly* in a Way less liable to give Offence, seeing he was determin'd to oppose them.

I have carefully consider'd what next follows, and can't be sensible that I am an unfair Adversary, or have deserv'd the hard Words that Mr. P. speaks of, p. 9. 'Tis very uncommon for him to wave an Advantage of this Nature; and therefore if he hath done it, which I can't see, I am the more oblig'd. That which I said of the *Subscribers* was, that there was no Appearance of any thing but *Harmony* and *Unanimity*, *Zeal* and *Cheerfulness*, and that they discover'd nothing like Reluctancy in what they did: And can Mr. P. venture to deny this? And why then should he suppose they were not voluntary? or that they were mov'd by worldly *Hopes* or *Fears*? Can this be any other than an uncharitable Supposition? Is not this in Effect to say that they act the Hypocrite? that they went against the Sense of their own Mind? and that for the sake of Bread they could turn themselves into any Shape? I don't see but the Expressions, let them be turn'd which way they will, must still come to this Sense. And whereas Mr. P. says, p. 8. " That he is well
 " assur'd that some of the *Subscribers* did before,
 " and others since their *subscribing*, express their
 " Dislike of the Method taken: " If hereby he
 C means,

means, that 'twas not with their liking that they subscrib'd, I challenge him to name the Persons, and produce his *Vouchers*: because, as is evident hereafter, Mr. P. hath not always the best Information; because I can't think so hardly of any of the *Subscribers* as to believe 'tis true; because I know they have too much Sense to imagine, that whilst they were *Accessaries*, the *Managers* only could be answerable for the imposing Spirit: I know of none of them but are pleas'd with what they have done, and would do it again with great Chearfulness if there was Occasion; such an Abhorrence have they of all those Notions that they think to be derogatory to our great *Sanctifier* and *Saviour*.

'T WAS very plain, that Mr. P. did justly stile his Charity an *unfashionable Charity*, and therefore I can't deserve Censure for endeavouring to put him out of Conceit with it. And it farther appears now that I had reason to attempt this, by his saying, p. 9. that Charity is so much out of Fashion with *our Party*. 'Tis, I think, one of the noblest Charities to attempt the Suppression of these Errors, that we judge to be so very hurtful to the Souls of Men. And I would fain know what the *Assembly* have done, or advis'd others to do that's inconsistent with Charity. Does it argue any want of Charity to acquaint the World with our steadfast Adherence to our former Faith? or to caution our People against all those that would corrupt it? Nay, does not Charity oblige us to do this, when we can't help thinking, that by giving up these *Articles* of their Holy Religion, they greatly endanger their eternal Salvation? What other Encouragement have the *Assembly* given to our Animosities? And when Mr. P. must know, that we were all in *Confusion* before ever our Controversy was brought into the *Assembly*,

I am astonish'd that he should say, *p.* 10. "That we had been very quiet had it not been for them." And whereas Mr. P. says, 'tis still in our Power to restore Peace; I am very sure it is not, unless it was possible to bring Mr. P. &c. to give up their present Notions about the *Trinity*. The most that we can do in our present Circumstances, is to love the Persons of all, and hate all *Doctrines* and *Practices* that are dishonourable to the Blessed JESUS and the HOLY GHOST. This is what we have done, and continue to do: and yet however we find that Peace is not restor'd. And how the Wound can be heal'd without Sacrificing *Truth* and a *good Conscience* to *Peace*, I can't see.

WHATEVER hath been suggest'd, the Difference between us is not about *Subscribing*, or *Non-Subscribing*. Mr. P. hath satisfy'd the World that it is not; but that he is really gone into the *Arian* or *Socinian Scheme*, or that which is a *Mixture* of both. 'Twas this that gave me occasion to say, that all the Influence the Assembly have, &c. With this saying, I find *p.* 10. he is greatly offended. He tells me, "He could easily retaliate, and that this is, *perhaps*, the only reason why they must never expect a conceited Person well known to me, to be on their side." There's no one but must think, that I am the Person struck at in this Reflection: But I can't upon the severest Recollection find, that I have any otherwise given Mr. P. occasion to think me *conceited*, than by my answering his *Remarks*, and once accepting his *Challenge* to the Assembly for a *Disputation*; which by the way he overlooks in his *Western Inquisition*, *p.* 177. representing it, as if his Motion for a publick-Disputation was rejected, and that no one would Dispute with him but on the *Spot* immediately: Whereas in Truth, the

thing was declin'd by Mr. *P.* himself, on my Acceptance of his *Challenge*. These are the only things that I can think of, that could move Mr. *P.* to speak as he does. If my Concern for the Truth, may in these Instances have carried me too far, it can't be thought any *extraordinary Presumption*, especially when I own'd with Pleasure, and a great deal of *Sincerity*, at the time that the Business of the Disputation was mov'd, the Superiority of many of my Brethren, as I do now again; whose Assistance I had reason to expect if there was Occasion. Mr. *P.* can't say, that ever I gave the least Intimation that I thought my self fit to be the Head of what he calls *our Party*: Nor can he say, that he ever heard me boast of my own Performances. But that he may not be at a Loss why I can't be of his side, I sincerely assure him, that 'tis because I don't think him to be on the side of Truth: And whilst these are my Thoughts, I must continue where I am, and he may go on to give me what reproachful Titles he please, and I believe without giving me half the *Disturbance* that he must himself. I only beg leave to acquaint him, that it must be by better Arguments, if I am made a *Proselyte* to his Party.

WHAT I said of our People's not pinning their Faith on our Sleeves, I see no reason to retract. It can't be expected of all plain ordinary Christians; that they should examine and canvass these things as *Scholars* and *Learned Men* do; and yet, they may have examin'd these things sufficiently, to satisfy themselves and excite their *Zeal*, when their Faith is attack'd with an *Air* so *assuming* and *magisterial* as they have seen it to be: And this I believe our People have done, with as much *Honesty*, *Humility* and *Impartiality* as other Persons. If I guess right at the Instance Mr. *P.* refers to,

p. 9. the most that I know of it is from him and those on his side : But this is so unlike *Dissenters*, who use to be better instructed, that Mr. P. I hope will allow me to suppose, that this Matter hath not been so justly represented. But if I find it hath, when it hath been examin'd, as it will I suppose by another Hand ; I can be no *Apologist* for such Persons, only I much bewail their Case, that the *Gentleman* that complains of them, hath not taken more care to inform them better. Mr. P. hath put it out of my Power to say any thing of the other *Facts*, when he neither names Persons nor Places. (There may perhaps be a secret Reason for not doing this :) But if these have no better Foundation than some of his other *Stories*, 'tis very reproachful to the Impartiality of an *Historian*, as also a great *Abuse* upon the present and succeeding Ages, as well as the Persons more immediately concern'd, to lay them as Matters of Fact before the World, when they are not so.

HAD the *Assembly* been of an imposing Spirit, and discover'd a malicious Intention to ruin any, (whatever my Ingenuity be) I hope I should have manifested more of the Christian, than to come into Measures with them : But I can't help being of Opinion, that Truth may be defended, and Error exploded, without any such *Spirit* or *Design*. This, I allow may in *Consequence* bear hard upon some that have abandon'd the Truth : It may diminish their *Honour*, and possibly issue in their *Rejection* by their People : But will Mr. P. say, that this is a Reason why all should sit still, and suffer what they take to be Error, to be Triumphant ? Should some of the Ministers of any Church turn *Papists*, *Deists*, *Manichees*, &c. (the Supposition is just, because it hath been so) must therefore the other Ministers, who abhor those monstrous Errors, be indolent and unconcern'd upon

upon such an Occasion? Must all the Regard be shewn to *Persons*, and none to *Truth*, for fear it should injure those that have given it up? And why should it then in the present Case, where the Matter is not doubtful to us, any more than the contrary is to Mr. P.? If what we have done doth in Consequence bear hard upon any, we are sorry that their Notions won't allow them to satisfy their People: It can reflect no blame upon us, that they have such Notions and suffer by them. We did no more than what we thought to be our indispensable Duty; and if this by Accident hath turn'd to the Damage of any, 'tis such a Consequence as we wish with all our Hearts some had endeavour'd to prevent, tho' we could not without betraying that which I hope will be always dearer to us, not only than the *Reputation* of other Men, but our own Lives.

WHEN Mr. P. had said in his Remarks, p. 6. "That which most offends me is, that they should pretend with so much *Assurance*, &c." Who could ever have thought, especially one that had seen his *Writings*, that he meant no more by it than an entire Satisfaction? If this was all his Meaning, the Language will be allow'd to be so entirely new and disagreeable, that I might be easily led into a Mistake: But if he had not one Meaning then that can't be justify'd, as the Words sound, and is therefore given up; and another now, that is less offensive; why doth he still find fault with the *Assembly*, that they say they believe what they do believe? or that according to him, they are entirely satisfy'd in what they are entirely satisfy'd? Can't this be declar'd without giving the *Reasons* of that Satisfaction, unless we expect, "That our Judgment should stand instead of the Reason of our Faith." If it had been our Design at that time to give the Reason of our Faith, it might be expected

expected that we should have given our Reasons ; but seeing we only intended then to declare our Faith, and subscribe our Declaration, it would have been impertinent to have gone farther ; nor did we then, nor do we now expect that Persons should believe as we do, any farther than they see reason for so doing.

WHATEVER Mr. P. may imagine, there are Reasons that satisfy both our People and us. And as for the Terms in which our Faith is express'd, they are sufficiently understood to determine our *Assent* ; and that by Persons that are inferior, as well as superior to us, or even Mr. P. himself. And fain would I know, what there is in the Word Person, which is the Term Mr. P. chiefly objects against, that is more unintelligible when apply'd to the *Sacred Three*, than the Terms *Creator*, *Eternal*, *Omniscient*, *Omnipresent* are, when apply'd unto them ? Mr. P. can't be ignorant, that there may Questions be put about each of these, that are as difficultly answer'd as those that are put about the Word Person. And farther, Mr. P. should not so often object this, when in his own *Declaration of September 1718*. he says of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, that he believes they are Divine Persons. If he means that the *Son of GOD* is a created Person, he holds the *peculiar, distinctive Opinion of Arius*, and so is angry without Cause, that he is reckon'd an *Arian*. If he means uncreated Persons, he means I think the same that we do, and so hath no Reason to object. If he means a *Medium* between created and uncreated, he means something of which I suppose he can't have any Idea ; and must accordingly retract his *Censure*, or his *Declaration*. I therefore crave leave to advise Mr. P. either to forbear his Severity, or talk more intelligibly than others do.

Mr.

Mr. P. complains, p. 11, 12. that in speaking about a *Popish Inquisition*, "I have added to the Word Office vile, as also like Popish Inquisitors, and left out these softning Words, seem to be, and by this means aggravated what he says." But can Mr. P. honestly say, that I have aggravated any thing beyond his *Intention*, or the plain *Intention* of the Words? There is no *Protestant* that I know of, but looks upon the *Popish Inquisition* to be a *vile Office*. And what can those be but like Popish Inquisitors, that have set up and seem to imitate that vile Office? And if it appear to Mr. P. and he tell the World that we resemble, and are guilty of that which is Base and Tyrannical, I think I am not at all to be blam'd, because I was representing his Sense, and not the Sense of other Men. I therefore think his Expressions a great deal too harsh, and must have lik'd them abundantly worse if they had been harsher, and especially, when he is forc'd to give up the most stinging part of his *Favourite Charge*, and to own in effect, that we have no other *Inquisition* but what we have always had among us: No other, but what is to be met with in every *Protestant Country*: No other, but what is the Foundation of our own *Toleration*: Nor indeed any, but what ought to be in every religious *Society*, where Affairs are manag'd in an orderly and advantageous Manner.

If there may no Enquiry at all be made into the Knowledge, Faith and Behaviour of Ministers and private Christians, then the Church must be left in a worse Condition than *Civil Societies*, where Persons are not permitted to plead as *Counsellors*, or prescribe as *Physicians*, &c. without a previous *Enquiry*, and a suitable Satisfaction concerning their *Ability* and *Fitness* for what they design. And whereas Mr. P. says, p. 13. "That if I
2 " would

“ would speak to the Purpose, I must shew that
 “ the Method of condemning Persons without
 “ having any thing prov’d against them, is just in
 “ it self, or in the least countenanc’d by the Gos-
 “ pel ; or shew that the Assembly han’t actually
 “ taken such a Method.” I answer, that Mr. P.
 can’t but know without my shewing it, that the
Assembly never took upon them to condemn him
 or any other Person. And farther, I may venture
 to assure him, that if they had, as they would not
 have done it without much Cause ; so neither
 would they have attempted to do it without Proof :
 We han’t hitherto, that I know of, acted contra-
 ry to *Equity*, or any *Scripture* Rule. Our Pro-
 ceedings are so equitable, that they speak for them-
 selves : The most that they amount to is, to make
 an open, publick *Confession* of our Faith before the
 World, and a *Resolution* to act according to what
 we believe, leaving Mr. P. and all others, to be-
 lieve and act according to their own *Judgment* and
Conscience. There is nothing I am very sure in all
 this, that we have the least Reason to be asham’d
 of : ’Tis ridiculous to assert, that there is any thing
 like *Poperie* in it. Yea, so unlike are we to *Po-
 pish Inquisitors*, and so remote from the Method
 and Grand Design of a *Popish Inquisition*, that Mr.
 P. hath made it altogether unnecessary to clear
 our selves of that *Charge* ; being constrain’d, I sup-
 pose, by the Force of Truth to do it for us. I
 don’t perceive that Mr. P. can find any *Inquisition*
 among us, but what hath always been in the
 Church of GOD ; what is very innocent, and high-
 ly laudable, and will ever, I believe, be found ne-
 cessary to secure *Truth*, and prevent *Confusion*.

THAT Mr. P. may be under no farther Doubt
 concerning me, I assure him afresh, that I am ut-
 terly against all Methods of *Compulsion* for Con-
 science sake ; and for the *Toleration* of all that the

State thinks tolerable. I think all have a *Right* to civil Privileges, that have no *Principles* destructive to the *publick Safety*; and that 'tis going too far to punish any with *Bonds, Imprisonment, and such Severities*, because they han't the same Notions in Religion that we have. And if every particular Member of the *Assembly* hath not the same Sentiments of this controverted Case; yet there are very few, I believe, but have. And even that Brother to whom I am referr'd, tho' he seems to think otherwise, yet says in the same Place, "We meddle not with the Work of Magistrates, to whom GOD hath given so much Wisdom to judge for themselves and us." This to me argues, that this Matter which hath so often employ'd the *Thoughts* and *Pens* of learned Men on both sides of the Question, is to him a doubtful Matter. Let this be as it will, for my own part I freely declare against *Compulsion*, as sensible that Christianity hath condemn'd it; can never need it; and would suffer in its Interests and Reputation by it. And yet at the same time, I think I have a *Warrant* to reject all notoriously ignorant and wicked Persons, as also all *Idolaters*, whether *Socinian, Arian, Popish, &c.* from the Communion of the Church. *Righteousness can have no Fellowship with Unrighteousness. Light can have no Communion with Darkeness. Christ can have no Concord with Belial. He that believeth, can have no part with an Infidel. Nor can the Temple of God have any Agreement with Idols, &c.* 2. Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16.

FOR the Reason that I gave, p. 12. I still think it a loose Declaration, to say that we believe whatever the *Scriptures* say of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: For as this can't possibly be true, when it is said by *Arians, Socinians, Macedonians and Sabellians*, because they so widely differ in their Sentiments;

timents ; so such a Declaration as this, can't possibly give a rational Satisfaction : And therefore I don't know to what purpose the Saying of that great and good Man Mr. BAXTER is so often quoted. He might be glad, perhaps, that Persons manifested so great a Regard to Scripture, and so are we : But if he farther thought, that we ought to acquiesce in such a Declaration, without any farther Examination ; this, with Submission, can I think be judg'd no other, than one of the Imperfections of that excellent Person ; and this one would imagine Mr. P. thinks as well as I : For to decide the *Grand Question*, whether Men receive the Doctrine reveal'd in Scripture, he thinks it a proper Method, " To propose to them the Words " of the *Holy Ghost*, to turn them to the Places " of Scripture where it is reveal'd, and enquire " how they understand those Places. p. 15." I have no Objection at all against the Method ; and am satisfy'd, that it would have been acquiesc'd in with respect to those that might have objected against *subscribing* the *Article* of the Church of ENGLAND, &c. because 'twas the very Method propos'd, tho' not comply'd with in Mr. *Jacomb's Case*, when he would give us no other Confession of Faith in order to his Ordination, than in Scripture Words without any Explication.

THIS, I think, (whatever Mr. P. may) will help the *Assembly* very much, and serve to convince the World, that 'tis not for *human Articles*, but the *Doctrines* and *Sense* of the Scriptures contain'd in them, that we have been contending. And to speak my Thoughts, tho' I don't see how Mr. P. could avoid making such a *Concession*, when such different Senses are put upon Scripture Words ; yet hereby he hath wounded his own Cause to death ; and for ever put it out of the Power of his Friends to hide the *worst Opinions* under

the plausible Covert of Scripture Expressions : For if there may be Enquiry made into the Sense of Scripture, 'tis all we desire. This will enable us to judge for our selves, whether the Scriptures be wrested and perverted or no ; and if they be not, 'tis all we expect. The *grand Reason* why we have such an Antipathy to *Arian*, and other odd *Notions* is, because we judge them to be contrary to the Scriptures ; by these we are willing to have our Cause try'd ; with these are we willing to stand or fall : And indeed Mr. *P.* seems sensible that we would catch at this, and therefore takes care to put in a *Caveat* against the *Assembly*.

" This, (says he) *p.* 15. I speak upon a Supposition, of Persons having a Right to call others to an Account of their Faith, which I deny the Assembly had any Right to do in our Case, unless they had some Witnesses against us. " Thus because he had given too much with one Hand, he seems willing to take it away with the other : However, I may venture to assure Mr. *P.* that this will content us, if he will but allow it to be our *Right*, and also to assert it when we have *Witnesses*.

Mr. *P.* according to his usual Civility, is pleas'd next to tell the World, *p.* 16. " That I, according to my usual way, multiply Words here to no purpose. " I am willing that the World should judge between us, whether I do or no. I must own, I thought it to be to the Purpose, and do so still, when we were upbraided with the Example of the old *Puritans*, to take Notice of the *Harmony* that is between us ; to say that they scorn'd to dissemble their Sentiments concerning the *Trinity* : That they thought it to be an *Article* of too great Importance, not to be open and explicate in declaring their *Faith* concerning it ; and that they would have proceeded as we did, if in our Circumstances, without thinking themselves chargeable with

with setting up a *Popish Inquisition*, or proceeding by an Oath *ex Officio*. Mr. P. can't well deny any thing of this, because he must know it to be true: He says, "He speaks only of a Method of proceeding against Men." I deny that there was any such Proceeding at all: There were no *Articles* exhibited against any, nor any oblig'd to declare and accuse themselves. Those that thought fit to declare, and afterwards subscribe what they had declar'd, ought to have their Liberty; and so had those that did not: And if when 'twas so very necessary to quiet the Minds of the People, and establish Peace, and prevent the *Growth* of Error, Persons would not speak out; we could not help it, if the World would judge, that their Sentiments were not such as they should be. And what Reason can Mr. P. of all Men have, to speak against our Declaring, when he says, p. 16. "That if he thought his Sentiments absolutely necessary to Salvation, he should have been free and zealous in publishing them?"

THO' we have never said, that GOD will save none but such as believe as we do: Tho' we don't say this of *Papists*, or *Heathens*, whom yet we think to be *Idolaters*, and in a most dangerous State; because we can't tell what *Allowances* a merciful GOD will make for Mens great *Mistakes*: yet this we have always insisted upon, that the *Godhead* of our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost* is, (as our Brethren of *London* express it) the primary Article of reveal'd Religion.

To this *Article* there was a particular Regard shewn, when the *Assembly*, after the Liberty, was first form'd. This *Article*, as a *Fundamental* of that Faith that Ministers and People are to contend earnestly for, hath been inserted in all our *Confessions* of Faith at *Ordinations*. And therefore, seeing we have the same Opinion of its Moment now that

that ever we have had; but yet were represented (whatever Mr. P. may suggest) as having given it up; 'twas a *piece of Justice* that we ow'd to our *Religion* and *Reputation*, to our *Congregations* and *Posterity*, that we should be free and zealous in purging our selves, and publishing our Sentiments; as it seems Mr. P. himself would have been, if he had had the same Apprehensions concerning this Doctrine that we have. Mr. P. was not a Stranger to our Apprehensions, (whether well grounded or not, is not so material,) and therefore it shews an unaccountable Temper, that he should so heavily censure the *Assembly*, for the thing that he himself must have done under our Apprehensions. And 'tis the more unaccountable still, that to render us the more odious, he should represent us, as proceeding by an Oath *ex Officio*, and own at the same time that we do not, and must also know, that there is not such a Resemblance in the Cases as he pretends. Let any one read what *Fuller*, and others have wrote upon this Head, and he'll be convinc'd of the Truth of what I say.

If Mr. P. could have purg'd himself with the same Sincerity that the *Subscribers* did, he might possibly have had the same Sentiments of its Necessity, and so have come into Measures with us; but this I leave to himself. 'Tis sufficient to justify us, who are the proper *Judges* of our own Actions, that nothing appears to be unwarrantable in what we did; and that we have done, as I apprehend, no inconsiderable Service to the Interest of Religion. And when it appears as necessary and expedient, that we purge our selves of any farther Charges, what Mr. P. offers may be consider'd: and then 'tis likely it will appear, that he and his Friends, if they think fit to come among us, are the great *Sticklers* against the *second Article* of

of the Church, as they are the only *Opposers* of the first. Yea, 'tis undeniable, that if they disbelieve the *first*, they can't assent to the *second*.

WHATEVER Mr. P. pretended in his Remarks, I perceive now, that I rightly guess'd, 'twas not so much in regard to others, who had no more Inclination to subscribe than himself; as to puzzle the *Assembly*, and stop their Proceedings, (that according to Mr. P. p. 17. are not much to our Credit) that he made his Motion about the Word *Person*. Mr. P. must excuse us, if we differ in Opinion from him, as to the *Equity* and *Creditableness* of our Proceedings. If Mr. P. had no mind to subscribe himself, nor knew any of his own side that had, whatever Explication had been given of the Word *Person*, what great Reason could the *Assembly* have, to gratify those that had a mind to wrangle, but not to be satisfy'd? 'Twas sufficient in the *Assembly*, that they were ready to give what Satisfaction they could to such as manifested a Willingness to have their *Scruples* answer'd, and to shew that Regard to *Truth* and *Peace* that Ministers ought: And this they did to that Person of very valuable Abilities that I spake of; If he had desir'd more, he might have been gratified in more, having manifested upon this Occasion, a Disposition so praise-worthy of a *Christian* and *Minister*, and those extraordinary Endowments that GOD hath been pleas'd to furnish him with. If any of those that did not join with us, had discover'd any thing of an Inclination to be satisfy'd, there would no doubt have been all just Regard paid to what they might propose, as there plainly was in another Instance: But when Persons had fix'd their Inclinations before hand, and had nothing else in View, for ought we could perceive, but to embarrass the *Assembly*, I can't forbear thinking, that we acted just as we ought upon this Occasion.

I can't but very much wonder, that all the *Writers* and *Talkers* upon this *Controversy*, those I mean that oppose the receiv'd Doctrine, should be so inconsistent with themselves, as to be always making a great Noise about *Scripture*: Calling for *Scripture Evidence*, clear and express *Scriptures*, &c. and when these are brought, immediately run us into *Metaphysical Niceties* about the Word *Person*. I think nothing can be clearer in *Scripture* and *Reason*, than that there is but one *GOD*: I think also, 'tis as evident as Words can make it, that the *Father* is God, the *Son* God, and the *Holy Ghost* God. I think also, that it is as clear and manifest as it can be, that there are such *Powers*, *Properties*, *Perfections*, *Works* ascrib'd to *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as can be ascrib'd to no created God: to none but *GOD* most high. There have *Scriptures* been brought to prove these things over and over; which never have been, nor I believe never can be answer'd. And therefore to wrangle everlastingly about *Person* and *Being*, is to turn off the *Controversy* from its proper *Foundation*; and instead of bringing our *Philosophical Speculations* to *Scripture*, to bring *Scripture* to our *Philosophical Speculations*. And should the same Liberty be taken thus boldly to *Philosophize* upon other parts of Religion, as there hath been of late with respect to the *Trinity*; I dread to think what the dismal Consequence would be. If we can but keep up the *Authority* of *Scripture*, we have no reason to fear: But if a poor finite *Worm*, a Creature of Yesterday, shall take upon him to reject all that he can't comprehend of an infinite God; his God, for ought I see, must in a little time be not only like, but less than himself. All that I offer this for, is to check the *Vanity* and *Wantonness* that appear in some Mens *Imaginations*.

MR. P. would fain have an Explication of the Word *Person*, as it stands in the *Article* : I hope he'll allow me also to desire an Explication of it, as also of the Word *Being* as they stand in his Answer. If by [*Persons*] he means, (as I suppose he must) that they are three distinct, separate, divided *Beings*; as different from one another as infinite and finite can be : so I say, that the Scripture never speaks of them as such. According to me, the Scripture speaks of *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, as three that are distinct, and act intelligently; having a real Existence in the same undivided *Nature* or *Essence*. Thus I apprehend they are spoken of in the *Baptismal Form*; as also in the *Apostolical Benediction*, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. I don't look upon [*a Person*] to be a meer *Name* or *Quality*, a meer *Modus* or *Ens Rationis*; that hath no Existence but in our Understandings. Nor did that great and excellent Person think so, whose Words I us'd rather than mine own, because of his abundantly better Judgment and Reputation. Mr. P. says, "He is not at all the wiser for what he says." I say the very same with Respect to his *Metaphysical Jargon*, of *Differentia Essentialis*, and *Accidental*. The Archbishop, 'tis known, had a peculiar Aversion to all such *Cobweb, fine-spun Divinity*. All therefore that he means, if I take him right is, that the Scripture spake of three that differ: He doth not say how; that he thought, 'tis likely, too bold to determine : But that which he says is, that every one is GOD, and every one distinct, so that the Person of one is not the Person of the other; and yet that all three are but one GOD. And 'tis as thus distinct, and yet one, that they are spoken of in the *Collective Sense* of the *Assembly*. The Terms *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, don't in themselves, any more than in Scripture Language, import that they are only three

E

Names

Names of the same Being : Nor were they so understood by any one of the *Subscribers* that I know of. They were understood by them, I apprehend, as the Scriptures understood them, as three real distinct Persons : and if so, the Proposition can't possibly be inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Scriptures, unless the same thing is inconsistent with it self.

I may hope, having thus gratified Mr. *P.* that he will one time or other, gratify me with the Explanation of his Sense of the Word [*Person*] as apply'd to *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; seeing he says, he hath no Objection against the Term it self. And particularly I shall desire to be inform'd, whether these *Divine Persons*, as he calls them in another Place, have one true and proper *Divinity*? Whether they have a *Divinity* of a different sort and kind from what *Magistrates* have? (tho' by the way I think 'tis very improper to say these have any *Divinity*; nor do we use to talk after this Rate.) And farther, I should particularly desire to know, whether these three distinct intelligent Beings that are called *GOD*, and allow'd to be *GOD* in some Sense, are finite or infinite Beings, eternal and necessary existent Beings, or not? Whether we must understand them to be unchangeable Beings, or changeable? to be infinitely Wise, Powerful, Just, Holy and Good, or not? If we don't thus come out of our *Ambiguities*, and understand one another, we may talk on eternally in the dark, without any one's being much the wiser or better for what we say. And to satisfy Mr. *P.* that I am thus willing my self to be understood, my *Notion* is, that it may justly be said of the *Son*, as well as the *Father*, and of the *Holy Ghost* as well as either, that they are infinite, eternal, unchangeable in their Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness and Truth. The Scriptures, I apprehend,
ascribe

ascribe all these Perfections to each of the Persons of the ever adorable *Trinity*, more generally and comprehensively when they call them *God*, and more particularly when these things are said of them, and ascrib'd to them, and this 'twill be time enough to prove, when I know particularly what it is that Mr. *P.* will deny.

WHAT Mr. *P.* farther says about the Postscript, p. 19, 20, 21, 22. hath little more in it than Acknowledgments of his own Mistake, and some little angry Reflections on me; and therefore I hope he'll forgive me that I pass it by, after I have told him, that I am satisfy'd in what Mr. *Withers* hath done; and that I am sure that Mr. *P.* might have satisfy'd not only me, but the *Assembly* too, if he had done the same: And that I appeal to all Judges of Languages, whether what Mr. *P.* says about Mr. *Withers's* not caring to have his Name appear in our *Squabble*, could justly be understood any otherwise than I understood it: But seeing he gives it another *Turn*, I am satisfy'd he should have Liberty to explain himself, tho' by the way, I don't know that there was any wrathful Treatment of our Brethren; and if there was, I don't see with what Propriety it could be call'd a *Squabble*. And I wonder that Mr. *P.* who never seems to be at a Loss for hard Words, should here give it a softer Name than it must deserve; if He is not under a Mistake.

In considering what I have offer'd in Answer to Mr. *P.'s* Remarks, on our Resolution he says, p. 22. he shall pass over the declamatory Part. I am not uneasy that he should give it what Title he pleaseth: But the Reason of his passing it by, will, by the most, I apprehend, be thought to be, that he could not clear himself of what I said seem'd to be his Design, viz. that the World should form an *Idea* of us by this Character, and so look upon us as some of the most infamous

Hypocrites and Tyrants; as those that delight in nothing so much as Blood: As those that want nothing but Power, to fine, imprison, scourge and hang Men, as so many *Nusances* to the *Common-wealth*, and such as deserve the Abhorrence of God and Man. There hath scarce any thing been more common of late than this uncharitable *Rant*, as Mr. P. must well know, among those that plead so much for *Charity*, and for ought I see, Mr. P. applauds the *Practice*, and seems willing that they should go on after the same *Rate*; and whether they had not the Word first from him, he can best tell.

MR. P. I find, p. 22. will insist upon it, that we are chargeable with *Insincerity*, for disclaiming a Jurisdiction over other Mens Consciences: However slightly Mr. P. may talk of such a *Charge*, when he says, "It must fall of it self, and so the Danger of it cannot be great, if the Fact on which he grounds it is not sufficiently supported:" Yet the *Charge* is of so high a Nature, and so unfit to be brought by one Christian against another, that I should abhor to bring it against a Man that doth not disclaim it; and much more against one that doth: and most of all upon such a poor Foundation as Mr. P. supports his *Charge* by. The Matter of *Fact* was, that there was a *Form* of Words to be assented to, to which, for the *Honour* of God, the *Security* of Truth, the *Peace* of the Church, and the *Credit* of *Dis-senters*, we should have been very glad if Mr. P. and others could have given their Assent: But if they could not, why should this restrain the *Liberty* of those that could, and were willing to do the best Service that they could by such a Method to their own injur'd Reputation? What *Violence* was this to Mr. P. or Brethren? And what *Jurisdiction* could be claimed over other Mens Consciences,

ences, when 'twas with our own, and not with theirs that we had to do ? We did not desire that they should act against their Consciences, and we were resolv'd not to act against our own, as we must, if we had not by this or some other Method, shewn our Abhorrence of these Errors that were spreading among us. Our Sincerity, I think, stands clear, notwithstanding Mr. P.'s notable Illustration of his *Charge*. Nor did I overlook any *Passage* or *Argument* in Mr. P.'s Remarks, because I thought it too plain ; but some I own I might, and this among the rest, because I could not perceive that 'twas to the Purpose ; and had it not been to gratify Mr. P. I should have overlook'd it now as well as then.

MR. P. says, p. 23. " He takes it for granted, " that by the *Assembly* a Penalty was inflicted on " him and his Brethren for the sake of their Con- " sciences." With his leave, this is what I can't allow ; and therefore ought to be prov'd, and not taken for granted. He says, " We know not what can " be a Penalty, if rendring us odious to our Peo- " ple, and representing us as unfit for the Work " which God has call'd us to, be not a Penalty." Mr. P. I think, should be the last Person that talks after this Rate ; because, I am sure he represents us not only to our People, but the whole World, as odious and unfit for our Work : And not us only, but all that approve of the Steps that we have taken : And this he doth, tho' what we did was, (to use his own Words) from a Sense of the *Duty* and *Allegiance* that we owe to CHRIST, that we might shew our selves faithful to the Trust repos'd in us. And therefore, if Mr. P.'s Argument proves any thing, it will prove at least against himself, that he hath claim'd to himself a *Jurisdiction*, not only over the Consciences of the *Ministers* of these two *Counties*, but over the greatest part

part of the *Christian World*. Mr. P. must know, that we don't use to talk to this purpose. Was ever any one so weak as to charge *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or any of the *first Reformers*, with claiming a Jurisdiction over the Consciences of the *Romish Clergy*, because they speak so freely against their Corruptions? Did ever any charge them with such a Jurisdiction, for expecting a *Renunciation* of the Popish Errors, that they might be permitted to officiate among them? What is it to Mr. P.'s, or any Man's Conscience, that the *Assembly* will encourage none but such as own the Doctrine of the Trinity? If Mr. P. or others can't or won't do it, we leave them to their own Consciences. And if their particular Opinions affect their Reputation, it may be their own Fault, but is not ours. We have nothing to do with other Mens Consciences, but desire to keep our own void of all Offence towards God and Men: which in our unhappy Circumstances we could not, without making such a *Stand* as we did against what we thought then, and still think to be one of the grossest and most dangerous Errors.

MR. P. will have it, "That our Design must be to fix an Odium upon all that would not submit their Understandings to our prescrib'd Declarations." I took Notice of other Designs, which I am sure we have no reason to be asham'd of, (*viz.*) the maintaining the Honour of our GOD and SAVIOUR, the Security of our holy Religion, and the Benefit of the Church of CHRIST, and particularly that of our own People. And as for the *Odium* Mr. P. talks of, it was fix'd already, and especially on himself, before the *Assembly* did at all interpose in that Affair. He was talk'd of both in *City* and *Country*, amongst his own People and elsewhere, as one that was gone off from the receiv'd Doctrine of the *Trinity*. And thus

I

much

much it seems he himself had intimated to three considerable Persons in his own Congregation in May 1717. * And can it be thought that Mr. P. who was so open to those that he knew were so much against the *Arian Scheme*, should be more shy with those that were inclin'd thereto, and gone into it? Whatever *Odium* therefore there may be in the Matter, 'twas what he had fix'd upon himself, or his Friends for him. And 'twas not, as it appears now, a *groundless Rumour*, but a *real Case*. And if it had not, the *Assembly* gave Mr. P. a fair Opportunity to clear his Reputation (which I know had for a considerable Time been under the Reproach he complains of) if he had been able, and had thought fit.

It doth not appear by any thing Mr. P. hath said, that the *Managers* without Doors, if he means any that manag'd by the Direction of the *Assembly*, did brand him or others with the Name of *Arians*: And yet, if any had given them that Name, I don't see why it should give so much Offence: when 'twould be difficult, perhaps, for Mr. P. to shew that they differ a Hair's breadth from that grand *Corrupter* of the *Faith* and *Worship* of Christians, and *Disturber* of the Peace of *Christendom*, in the two first of his gross and distinguishing Errors, that were mention'd at the *Assembly* 1718. by the Reverend Mr. *Withers*, and since publish'd in the *Western Inquisition*, p. 104. (*viz.*) That CHRIST is but a *Creature*, and that there was a time when he had no Existence. For can Mr. P. who pretends to be so much for clear Ideas say, that 'tis not to talk contrary to such Ideas, as well as unintelligibly and without Ideas, to say, that our Saviour is neither GOD nor Crea-

* *Western Inquisition*, p. 14, 15.

ture : or to say, that any thing is properly eternal, that is not necessarily existent as God is ? When therefore 'tis so common among all, to call the Followers of *Luther*, *Lutherans* ; and the Followers of *Calvin*, *Calvinists* ; and the *Votaries* of the *Pope*, *Papists* : It can't be out of the common Road, to call the Followers of *Arius*, *Arians* : And yet, I don't see that Mr. P. hath the least Evidence that the *Mob* had the *Watch-word* from us ; they had the Word among them before any thing was transacted in the *Assembly*. Mr. *Stogdon* had own'd himself an *Arian*, and gloried in it, and had Mr. P.'s *Testimonial* before : And this, as I gather from Mr. P. was known among those that he calls the *Mob*. And farther, one of those that Mr. P. reckons a chief *Manager*, did all that he could to discourage these *Titles* that were thought reproachful. And for my self, I can also say, that long before the *Assembly* of 1718, I have several times done all that I could to vindicate Mr. P. from having embrac'd the *Arian Notions*, as he was charg'd, as charitably hoping then that he had not. This puts it beyond Doubt, that 'twas not owing to the *Assembly*, that Mr. P. and Brethren were reputed as *Arians*, and did pass for such. Nay farther, I can be pretty sure that they had this Character before *Arius Detected* came out : However this latter be, which I believe is just as I have represented it, it can't become one that complains so much of reproachful Titles, to charge another with *malicious Designs*, as Mr. P. doth the Author of *Arius Detected*.

I shan't assert, that 'tis usual with Mr. P. to speak contrary to his own Sentiments ; but I have pretty good Evidence, as I shall shew hereafter, that he is not always upon his Guard in this respect as he should be. As to the Matter mention'd, p. 25. I have two very credible Witnesses, that

that he hath said; that he believ'd no *Minister*, or *Dissenter* of Worth, had any hand in raising the *Mob*. And how he comes to be so fully persuaded of a thing, of which I can't see he hath the least Proof, and the contrary to which I am able to prove by himself, is, I confess, that which I can't understand.

WHEN Mr. *P.* says, "That when we could not
 " oppress them by the Power of the *Magistrate*,
 " &c." there is no Reader but would understand it
 as I did, that we had attempted to do so. Mr. *P.*
 can't deny that his Words import thus much; and
 now, instead of making good his *Charge*, he tells
 us, p. 24. "He had reason to believe, that the
 " Assistance of the *Magistrate* was desir'd, if not
 " sought by the Party: Because when we were in
 " so much Expectation of Ease by the Act which
 " pass'd the last Sessions, it was in several Places
 " given out, that it would contain somewhat
 " that would not please us. That Complaints
 " were mention'd in a great *Assembly* as received
 " from *Exeter*, and a Motion was made for the
 " adding to the Bill a new Test. That it was
 " not uncharitable to suppose, that they might
 " have a Hand in sending up the Complaint, who
 " were before-hand made privy to the Design."

I would ask Mr. *P.* whether this can amount to
 any thing like a Proof of his Charge? Could not
 a common piece of News be heard and spoken of,
 without soliciting the *Parliament* to add a *Test* to
 their Bill? Were there none to send up these
 Complaints that are mention'd, but the Managers
 of the *Assembly*? And were not others more like-
 ly to do it than they, considering by whom the
 Motion was made in both Houses? If Mr. *P.*
 will thus draw up Charges upon his own ground-
 less Surmises, without any other Evidence, his
 angry Fancy may form a Thousand such Charges,

F and

and then lay them upon the *Assembly*, and when they can't be prov'd, come off with this lame Excuse, I had reason to believe, and 'twas not uncharitable to suppose: But this, according to his own Language, would be very unrighteous Dealing, such as he would by no means like in others, and therefore should dislike in himself; and especially, when he must know, as in this Case, that he had no reason to believe it; and that therefore it was uncharitable to suppose it. As I have declar'd it already, so I declare it again, that I utterly abhor all sorts of *Persecution*, and this of *false Accusation* among the rest.

I can have no Occasion, where there is so much *Sting* and *Severity*, to aggravate any thing beyond its due Proportion, as Mr. P. p. 25, 26. pretends I do: nor to be upon the hunt after Scandal, where it must unavoidably be met with. I can have no great reason to expect Allowances from Mr. P. nor am I sensible that I have said any thing here that needs them, or what his Words did not fairly lead me to: But if he design'd any thing that was soft and extenuating, (which yet I did not perceive, nor doth he say,) I beg his Pardon: and the rather, because this is so great a *Rarity* in his Remarks. 'Tis possible I might once overlook, what I could not well expect to find.

I don't see that there was any room for Mr. P.'s little *Criticism* on my Language, p. 26. What I said, I think was intelligible and just; and might be supported by *Authorities*, that were better Masters of Sense and Language than ever I pretended to be: But yet, to convince him that I shall not stand with him for little things, or am govern'd by a Spirit of Contradiction, I'll leave him the Honour and Satisfaction of his Remarks: However, I can by no means allow, that what he afterwards says doth affect the *Assembly* with a
Witness;

Witness ; but on the contrary, think that he hath given up the Cause, silenc'd all the *Noise* and *Cry* of Imposition, and granted all that I desire. For if what immediately follows be granted by him, as he says it is, *viz.* " That we are limited " to ordain none but faithful Men, and that we " must judge whether they are so : That we can't " be satisfy'd to ordain Persons without knowing " what their Notions are ; or when upon know- " ing them, we apprehend them to be destructive " to the Souls of Men. That he never ordain'd " any himself without such Satisfaction, and that " he does not know any that care to be concern'd " in an Ordination without such Satisfaction. " If all this be granted, 'tis the utmost, I think, that the *Assembly* or I do, or need contend for : For this is plainly to allow, that we may judge who are fit, and who are unfit ; and accordingly that we may receive some, and reject others, without claiming a *Jurisdiction* over Conscience.

If Mr. P. will allow that we have a *Right* to be satisfy'd, then it must unavoidably follow, that there can't possibly be a rational Satisfaction, when quite contrary Senses are put upon *Scripture*, which is the *Ground* and *Rule* of all our Satisfaction. 'Tis impossible that I can have Satisfaction from one that says, we are to worship none but GOD ; and from another, that we are to worship *Creatures* : The *Notions* are destructive of each other, so that if one be true, the other must be false, and consequently can give no Satisfaction : And the same holds true, with respect to the *Article* of the *Trinity*. 'Tis impossible that I can have Satisfaction from one who says, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are GOD over all ; and another that says they are not, but are *Creatures*, or which is perfectly unintelligible, a *Medium* between GOD and a *Creature*. Take it which way we will, the Notions,

GOD and a Creature, GOD and a Medium between the Creature and Himself, are incompatible. If one be true, the other is not; and therefore both can't give a rational Satisfaction. If therefore I must have Satisfaction, when concern'd to License or Ordain a Minister, and can't answer for my Conduct unless I have; I am under a Necessity of refusing to ordain those that I must think do wrest and pervert the Scriptures, and especially in those Matters that do most nearly concern the *Faith*, the *Practice* and *Salvation* of Men. For which reason, I, who profess to be a *Protestant* and *Trinitarian*, can have no Satisfaction in ordaining *Papists*, *Arians*, *Socinians*, *Macedonians*, &c. because I can't have Satisfaction; but that their Principles are most contrary to Scripture, and also very hurtful to the Souls of Men.

THIS Matter I urg'd, p. 20. but Mr. P. is pleas'd very prudently to wave saying any thing about it; because, I think, upon his Concession 'twill admit of no Answer. And this Mr. P. seems sensible of, and therefore says, p. 27. "That if I will shew
 " that the *Article* we insist on is necessary to be
 " believ'd, the *Controversy* will be at an end; and
 " he'll be as forward to justify the *Assembly*, and
 " condemn himself and Friends as I can be." I don't know that ever I have manifested any other Forwardness to condemn him and his Friends, than by shewing my Dislike of his and their Principles: And the reason why I dislike them is, because, after the best and most careful Examination of the sacred Scriptures that I am capable of, I think them to be directly contrary thereto; and also, that they are contrary to the Scriptures, in an *Article* of the greatest Importance to Christians, viz. the right Knowledge of GOD; whom we can no otherwise worship, love and serve, than according to the Apprehensions that we have of him. Whilst
 therefore

therefore I have, and can't but have such settled Apprehensions concerning Mr. P.'s or any Man's Principles, that they are directly contrary to Scripture, I can't have sufficient Satisfaction to go upon. I must betray the Trust that CHRIST hath repos'd in me, should I commit it to those that I think do err in so material a Point : And this Mr. P. is not able to deny without retracting his own *Concession*.

THE true Question therefore is not as Mr. P. would have it, p. 26. "Whether we may insist upon a particular Notion that GOD doth not insist upon." This is so far from being a Question with me, that I am as clear in this, as I can be in any thing, that we are not. But then, tho' we may not insist upon these Notions that GOD would not have us to insist upon; we may, nay we must insist upon: those that he would have us to insist upon: and herein, our Consciences under the best *Light* and *Direction* that we can get from the Word of GOD, must be our Guide. And this is so clear, that Mr. P. is forc'd to own, that even an erroneous Conscience will bind in this Case. If therefore we must act, or forbear to act according to the Dictates of Conscience, when the Conscience is suppos'd to be erroneous; it can't be less our Duty to do this, when the *Voice* of Conscience is the Voice of GOD, as we are fully persuaded it is in this Matter. 'Tis the Scripture must determine whether it be or no: of which when we have, as we are fully convinc'd, the true Sense and Meaning, we must insist upon it, notwithstanding the contrary Persuasions of other Men: And this we may, without claiming a Jurisdiction over other Mens Consciences, if we leave them to their own particular *Persuasions*, and are careful to act according to ours, as we must be. And if those that are for the *Episcopal Government*,
and

and think it absolutely necessary to Salvation, which is the Case Mr. P. puts, did go no farther than this : If they would persecute none that were otherwise minded, but suffer them to serve God, tho' they could not think as they do ; I must conclude, how much soever I think them to be mistaken, that they acted like honest Men, and could by no means charge them as claiming a Jurisdiction over other Mens Consciences. And 'tis to me undeniably evident that they do not, whilst they only make their own Persuasion a *Rule* to themselves ; and are free that others as well as they should *be fully persuaded in their own Minds*, and act accordingly.

THE same Answer will serve the Case that is mention'd, p. 34, 35. whether it be real or feigned. 'Tis observable, that Mr. P. there allows, that they could not concur in his Ordination whilst they had an Apprehension of the Destructiveness of his Principles. Their Duty therefore was plainly to forbear what they could not do with a safe Conscience ; and to leave the poor Man to be ordain'd by those that had other Sentiments, and could be better satisfied. In this Case, there is no assuming a Jurisdiction over other Mens Consciences, but such a care not to insult their own, as ought to be in every Christian and every Minister : And methinks, I don't know how to believe but Mr. P. must think as I do : But to satisfy him if possible, that he doth, or ought to act upon the same Principles, I shall crave leave in my turn, to put a Case or two to him.

THERE are some then, by drawing wrong Inferences from the Examples of the Apostles, and first Christians, who were many of them illiterate Persons, that are strongly persuaded that they are fit to be Ministers, tho' they are perfect Strangers to what they call in Derision, *humane Learning*.
I'LL

I'LL now suppose, that one of these should apply to Mr. P. and Brethren for their Approbation to preach, or to be ordain'd : How would they govern themselves in a Case of this kind ? I can hardly suppose that they would encourage the Ministry of such a one, as fearing that this would be to prostitute the *Office*, and to introduce *Ignorance* and *Confusion* into the Church of CHRIST. And this, I think, would be a very just Inference from the general Rules of Scripture, and a sufficient Justification of those that should refuse to encourage the *Ministry* of such a one : However, seeing 'tis but an Inference from the Words of the *Holy Ghost* that they go upon, and there is no Revelation in so many Words, that Men must be learned, and Scholars that they might be Ministers : Mr. P. I think, according to his way of arguing, must either proceed to encourage and ordain the Man, which I can't think he would do ; or claim a Jurisdiction over Conscience, which I can hardly think he would allow : And yet, I think, if the poor Man was honest and found in the Faith, he would do a Thousand times less hurt in the Church of CHRIST, than such as *Hymeneus*, and *Philetus* ; or even Mr. P. himself with the greatest *Stock* of *Learning*, when it may be very justly suppos'd, that one great Use that they would make of their *superior Abilities*, would be to overthrow the Faith of Christians.

BUT to put some other Cases afresh that relate to *Faith* and *Practice*, which, I presume are not overlook'd, because not to the purpose ; but because 'twas not for Mr. P.'s purpose to answer them. I'll suppose then, that a Person should apply to Mr. P. and Brethren for a *Licence* to preach, or for Ordination, who upon Examination according to Mr. P.'s own way, viz. upon the Scriptures, which I am far from making any

Objection against, should appear to hold the wild Opinions of *Socinus*, together with many of the Absurdities of *Popery*, which is the Case of many in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, &c. What Measures would they take in this Case? Would they venture to encourage or ordain one that held, that **CHRIST** was no more than a Creature, and one that had no Existence before his Conception in the Womb of the *Virgin Mary*? as also, that he was no otherwise a *Mediator*, than as he establish'd the new and everlasting Covenant with Men in the Name of **GOD**, and made known all the Will of **GOD**, by which a way is made open to **GOD** for us? * Farther, would they venture to ordain one who interprets all these Texts that speak of **CHRIST**'s making and upholding all things; as importing no more, than that Reformation that was made in the World by the Gospel? and that won't allow that we should pay our Saviour any Worship at all, as being contrary to Reason, and a Breach of the first Commandment; which hath been, and still is the Opinion of many *Socinians*? Farther, would they ordain one that denies the *Holy Ghost* to be any thing more than the *Gospel*: or a Gift that is given by **GOD** to Believers, and that the Assistance of the Spirit, which is one of Mr. *P.*'s own *Articles*, is neither necessary nor vouch'd to make us good? † And lastly, would they venture to ordain one that holds the Pope's *Infallibility*, the Doctrines of *Transubstantiation* and *Purgatory*, and those of praying to Images, Saints and Angels, &c? My Opinion is, that the Scriptures do abundantly condemn these blasphemous and absurd Notions; and therefore I can't honestly be concern'd in the Encouragement or

* Catech. Raco. p. 187. † Ibid. 162, 165.

Ordination of those that would propagate them. But these Gentlemen say that the Scriptures are on their side, and that accordingly they are ready to subscribe all the Words of the *Holy Ghost*: And farther, that what I bring from Scripture against them, are only my own *Inferences* and *Interpretations*, and accordingly they can't receive them as points of Faith. And what would Mr. P. and his Brethren say in their Case, if they could not convince them of their Mistakes? Should they refuse to ordain them, the Charge that is brought against the *Assembly* must lye hard upon them, viz. that they insisted to have their own Explications of Scripture receiv'd as points of Faith, and so claim'd a Jurisdiction over their Consciences. And on the other hand, if they ventur'd to ordain them, whilst they held their Notions to be unscriptural, and most injurious to the Souls of Men, I can't see how they could possibly answer it to CHRIST, or their own Consciences: How they could secure Truth, or prevent Error, or excuse themselves from being answerable for all the Mischief that should be done by the *Errors* and *Corruptions* of these Men.

FARTHER, I can't see, but that whilst they pretend such a peculiar Veneration for Scripture, there are none that seem to despise it so much, whilst they encourage all that agree in the *Sound*, but quite overturn what they themselves are suppos'd to take to be the *Sense* of Scripture. And then, to what a Pass must this bring the Church in a little time, when Orthodoxy and Error, Truth and Falshood have equal Encouragement! And how this can be avoided upon Mr. P.'s Principles, when all declare a Readiness to subscribe the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, even those that are most in the wrong, as well as those that are most in the right, I can't understand. He says

G

indeed,

indeed, that we must examine Persons upon Scripture: but how can this at all help the Matter? For when the *Arian* hath given his Sense, and the *Socinian* his, and the *Sabellian* his, and others theirs of these Passages of Scripture particularly, that relate to our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, I am as much at a loss as I was before. My Examination signifies just nothing. According to Mr. P. I have no Power to reject any, unless I am absolutely sure that he was in the wrong, *i. e.* in other Words, unless I was *infallible*. So that till God is pleas'd to make his Ministers *infallible*, there must, it seems, be a promiscuous Admission both to the Ministry and to Communion; and whether this be not as Dr. *Nichols* calls it * the very *Soul of Deism*, I leave to Mr. P.'s Consideration.

Mr. P. 'tis true, is pleas'd to say, p. 34. "That the fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion are few, and very plainly laid down in the Scriptures; particularly he says, that the great Design, if he mistakes not, of all the Accounts that are given in Scripture of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, is to induce Men to come to God, thro' JESUS CHRIST the only Mediator, by the Assistance of the SPIRIT: And that where he finds a credible Profession of Persons doing this, he is ready to receive them, however they may differ in their Speculations about abstruse Matters." But let me have leave to put him in Mind, that these, tho' not so to him, are *abstruse* Matters to some, as well as the *Divinity* of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Unity* of these with the *Father*; which, I suppose, are the *abstruse* Matters he refers to. His Articles will be no more allow'd by some, than

* Confer. with a Theist, 2^d Part, p. 84.

the first Article of the Church of *England* is by him. I'll suppose therefore, that one or more of the *Articles* of his own *Creed* (which by the way I think is loose and defective enough) should be disputed, would he give up these also, as well as others, and so receive all that would but own the Being of a God, and a few other undisputed Parts of Natural Religion? If not, I think he must according to his own Notion, assume a Jurisdiction over the Consciences of these to whom his own Articles are so far from being clearly reveal'd in Scripture, that according to them they are contrary to them: But, if when his own Articles should be disputed, and deny'd, he should give up these too, I think the clear Consequence is, that the *Bible* must follow next. There can, from the *Bible*, according to his Rate of Arguing, be no Terms of Communion, or Ordination fixt at all, no not Mr. P.'s own. Nay, Ordination it self must be rejected, if any one hath a Mind to officiate in the Church without it.

'Tis in vain, I think, to say ~~more~~ *Here* that these Things are plainly reveal'd in Scripture, and therefore may be insisted on; for if there be any thing in this *Plea*, our *Trinitarians* think, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is so too. 'Tis express'd in the Words of Scripture, that the *Father* is God, that the *Son* is God, and that the *Holy Ghost* is God: 'Tis said also in Scripture, in so many Words, that God made the Heavens and the Earth, and who the *Elohim*, (which is a *Plural Word*) or God here is, we are more particularly told in other places, viz. in those where 'tis said, that the World was made by the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*. Farther, 'tis also said, that God, and God only searcheth the Heart and Reins; and yet more particularly, that the *Father* searcheth the Heart, that the *Son* search-

eth the Heart and Reins, and that the *Spirit searcheth all things*, the Heart and Reins and other things also. And, thus might I go on to instance in other things, that are peculiar to the most High God; as particularly, his *Eternity, Omnipresence, &c.* when therefore these high and particular Things are said of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, in express Words of Scripture; there is no other *Consequence, or Inference* to draw than this, that these Three are of one *Substance, Power and Eternity*. And this, in my Opinion, is not only the clear and most natural *Inference* that can be drawn, but a *Scripture Inference* too; because whatever others may, I can't give up that Scripture where I find it, viz. 1 John v. 7. *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* Not one Person; for then they could not be three *Witnesses*, but distinguish'd like the three Witnesses on Earth, *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*, however still but one God; for which reason, their *Testimony* is very justly said to be the Witness of God, v. 9. And though we are so often told, and that not without a moderate degree of *Confidence*, that we have no Scripture for our *Article*; yet I hope, without any great Breach of Modesty, I may venture to say, that our *Article* hath as good a Foundation in Scripture as Mr. P.'s *Creed*, and that it may with equal Justice be insisted on. Mr. P. perhaps, according to his *Way*, may call this a loose way of Talking: But I have been us'd so much to that sort of Language, since conversant with the Writers against the *Trinity*, that it makes no manner of Impression upon me. Mr. P. in behalf of his own *Creed* says, p. 34. "That if Men set up other *Mediators* besides Christ, or Practise Idolatry, he hath a Warrant for rejecting them." Now in this I am entirely of his

his Mind; and for that Reason I can't be concern'd in the Ordination, or Encouragement of any professed *Papist*: But what if such a one should apply to Mr. P. and tell him with the Assurance of a *Unitarian* (as some affect to be call'd) that by the one *Mediator* spoken of in Scripture, we are to understand a *Mediator* of Redemption, but not of *Intercession*. That he allows there can be but one *Mediator* of the first sort, the *Man Christ Jesus*; but that there may be many of the latter, and that 'tis only an *Inference*, or *Consequence* of his drawing, that it is *Idolatry* to make solemn Application to such. What could Mr. P. do, if he should persist obstinately in his Opinion, notwithstanding any thing he could offer for his Conviction? Should he reject him whilst he thought he had the Scriptures on his Side, here would according to Mr. P. I think, be a claiming a *Jurisdiction* over his Conscience. Should he be admitted, he must admit one that he thought an *Idolater*, and that would promote *Idolatry* in the Church, and so could not answer it to God, the Church, or himself. For my own Part, I should make no Difficulty of rejecting such a one; because to me his Notions are quite contrary to Scripture. And for the same Reason, I must reject an *Arian*, or *Socinian*, that holds that Christ is to be worshipp'd; for that I can look upon neither to be any other than *Idolaters*; because they worship him, that they say by Nature is no God. And yet, I don't care to say of *Papists*, or *Heathens*, or any other *Idolaters*, especially when I find, that they are Men of *Virtue*, and *Sobriety*, that it is impossible that they should get to Heaven. Their Case to me appears to be extremely hazardous: But their *final Doom*, I leave as I ought, to the righteous Judge of Mankind, who knows what Allowances are proper to be made

made to all his Creatures. As I am a Minister, I must judge, as well as I am able by Scripture Direction, who are fit to be admitted as Ministers, and Members of the Church, and who not: And if any overturn the *Fundamentals* of Christianity, according to the best Judgment I can make of Things, I have a sufficient *Warrant* not to be concern'd either in their *Ordination*, or Admission to *Communion*. And though I think, that an erroneous Minister is likely to do a great deal more Hurt than an erroneous Communicant; yet I chuse to put both Cases together, to satisfy Mr. P. that I am not afraid, or asham'd to speak out, and let the World know, that I think it not only justifiable, but a Duty, to refuse Ordination to Ministers, and the *Seals* of the Covenant to private Christians, if they appear to deny the Faith of the Gospel. I don't see but one Case may be as easily understood as the other, and for this Reason I said they are much the same, and han't such a peculiar Turn of Thought as Mr. P. styles it, but that I might very consistently say, that I could not so well understand, unless it was to stir up a *Popular Odium*, that the Case of the People was consider'd. I can't perceive that one Case receives any Light from the other, though that of Communion be now the Case that's chiefly insisted on.

By what I have said, Mr. P. may easily see, that by unscriptural *Terms* of Communion, I mean no more nor less, than such *Terms* as are not requir'd in Scripture as *Terms*, or such *Terms* as have not a sufficient Foundation in Scripture. My Words were sufficiently plain, and therefore I can't see to what Purpose the Case of *Infant Baptism* is brought in. Mr. P. may have a secret Reason for mentioning this Case; but tho' I don't know that there is any Difference between
him

him and me about this Matter; yet seeing he hath given me Occasion, I'll mention another Case about *Baptism*, wherein I must insist upon it as a *Term* of Communion. My meaning is, that whatever the *Socinians* offer about the Nature, or Cessation of Baptism, I could admit none to the Sacrament that were not baptiz'd, and should still refuse it. Whether Mr. P. after his Friend Mr. *Emlyn*, &c. can go farther in this Case than I dare to do, I can't say: If he can, he knows I can say besides, a great many Things of greater Weight, that we have *no such Custom, neither the Churches of Christ*: But if he can't, I am apt to think, that he'll find it hard to prove, unless by clear Consequence from Scripture, that this Ordinance is to be continued among Christians to the End of Time. And accordingly this may help him to see, that Scripture Consequences may in some Cases be insisted upon, without claiming a *Jurisdiction* over other Mens Consciences. And yet after all, I should not care to say, nay, I would not venture to say, that such can't possibly get to Heaven.

I should have the same Objection against admitting those to Communion, that should follow their Ordinary *Trades*, or *Recreations* on the Lord's Day, except that Part of it that was necessary for Communicating once a *Month*, or *Quarter*, or to shew that they had not cast off all Regard to Publick Worship. And though Mr. P. may say, that this would be Wickedness, and therefore a just Objection against such, which I easily allow; yet as the Observation of this particular Day, and that in the room of the *Jewish Sabbath*, can no otherwise be prov'd than by Scripture Consequences, so the Wickedness of it must depend on the same Proof. And therefore, if Mr. P. in this Case agree with me, which I only

ly offer upon Supposition that he doth ; he must allow that there are some Cases, in which we are to govern our selves by Scripture *Consequences*, whether others see them or not. And yet to say of those that don't see them, and would act otherwise if they did, that it is impossible they should get to Heaven, is what I should not care to do. By this Mr. P. may perceive, perhaps, that if it was true what he suggests, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* can only be deduc'd by Consequences from Scripture ; yet this could not necessarily hinder, but that it might be insisted on, if the *Consequence* was clear, and unavoidable. But how far this with respect to the sacred, adorable *Trinity* is to be allow'd, I have already consider'd. The Scripture, as I have observ'd, is most express, that the *Father* is God, the *Son* God, and the *Holy Ghost* God, and that God is but one ; so that without the utmost Violence, and perverting the most obvious Sense, and Signification of Words, I have no other *Consequence*, or *Inference* to draw, but that these three are one God. Nor can I see the *Reason*, though I may the *Design*, why *Consequences* should be spoken of with such Contempt as of late they have been. They were formerly I know thought to be of great Importance, and so, I think, they should be still ; for if they are not, we in effect destroy at once all *natural Religion* : which though made up of *Inferences* drawn from the Works of Nature, is as far as it goes, as binding upon the Conscience, as *Reveal'd Religion* can be, and is in a Sense the Foundation on which *Reveal'd Religion* it self is built. Nor can it, I think, be said with any shew of Reason, but that there may *Inferences* be drawn from Scripture Assertions, as clear, and binding, as any that are drawn by the *Light*, and from the *Works* of Nature.

MR.

MR. P. is pleas'd to take Notice, p. 35, 36.
 " That he had given a clear Instance of the *Papists*
 " Practice, and the way of defending themselves,
 " which is now so common among *Protestants*."
 To this I thought I return'd as clear an Answer in
 five Pages, viz. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. to which
 Mr. P. with his usual *Complaisance* says, " That I
 " have bestow'd four Pages upon it, without say-
 " ing so much as one Word to the Purpose, and
 " desires the Reader to review them, but withal
 " says, that I have given him several Advantages
 " against my self. " Mr. P. undoubtedly may
 rake what Liberty he thinks fit to censure any
 Performance of mine. If he had thought conven-
 nient, he might have put out an *Advertisement* in
 one of his Pamphlets, that Mr. *Enty* had writ an
 Answer to his *Remarks*, which was nothing to the
 Purpose; which indeed is what he does say in effect,
 p. 91. and that therefore he would wave the Con-
 sideration of it, tho' he had given several Advan-
 tages against himself: This would have been a
 short and very easy way of answering what I offer'd;
 have sav'd himself the trouble of a large *Pamphlet*,
 and me the trouble of a larger *Reply*, and the
 World the trouble of reading what is said on both
 sides: But seeing he hath not thought fit to shut
 up the *Dispute* this way, I join with him in desir-
 ing the Reader to review these Pages; perhaps he
 may see another Reason why they are not consider'd,
 viz. that it would not have been for the Advantage
 of Mr. P.'s Cause to consider them. I am not so fond
 of any thing of my own, but that I can be content
 that it should be despis'd as much as 'tis by Mr. P.
 That which I wonder at much is, that Mr. P. should
 all at once, here and no where else, be in such good
 Humour with me, as to wave Advantages that I had
 given him: This is, as every Body must see, an
 H unusual

unusual *Candour*, and therefore no one, I presume, will blame me that I take Notice of it.

I have, I think, said enough to vindicate the *Englilh* in which our Resolution was exprefs'd; and to shew that there was no Occasion for Mr. P.'s Animadversion: But if notwithstanding Mr. P. insists upon having the last Word, the Matter is so small that I am content.

Mr. P. is pleas'd to give us an Intimation, p. 36. "That 'tis about seven Years since that he hath understood his Christian Liberty better." This, according to the best Calculation I can make, was about the time that by reading Mr. *Whiston* and Dr. *Clark*, he was brought to change his Notions about the Trinity *. So that without any breach of Charity it may, I think, be inferr'd, that it was out of particular *Fondness* for this new *Scheme* of Religion, that Mr. P. enlarg'd his Notions of *Liberty*. As for the *Dissenters*, who have since been call'd upon to vindicate themselves upon any other Notion of *Liberty*, they thought themselves safe, and so did Mr. P. too, without his *new Notion* of *Liberty*. They always complain'd, that it look'd hard that they should not only be shut out of the *Church*, but out of all Places of *Profit* and *Trust*, for things that were own'd to be indifferent on one side, but were not thought so by them. But since they have had the *Liberty* of their own *Consciences*, and are restor'd to their *Natural* and *Civil Rights*, they have been very easy and very thankful, tho' still oblig'd to subscribe the first *Article*. Only they don't understand yet, why any *religious Notions* that are allow'd not at all to interfere with the *publick Safety* in one part of the Kingdom, should disqualify for a Place of *Trust* in another; if there should be, as

* *Western Inquisition*. p. 7, 8, 9, 10.

sometimes

sometimes there are, any insuperable *Scruples* about the *Sacramental Test*.

THE *Dissenters* never yet claim'd it as a Branch of that *Liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free*, to be admitted to the *Ministry*, or *Church Communion*, without giving a satisfactory Account of the Soundness of their Faith. And if there had been any Difference between them and the *Church of England* as to this Matter, as there is not, they would have been fully satisfied to be left to their own *Opinion* and *Consciences*. But seeing Mr. P. speaks so much of his Christian Liberty, and nothing can possibly be understood hereby, but a *Liberty* granted by the Religion of our Saviour, which all have reason to be fond of as well as he; Where doth the Scripture say in so many Words, that we must subscribe no Words but the Words of Scripture, tho' never so agreeable to the Sense of it? Or where doth it say, that we must admit all to *Ordination* or *Communion*, that are ready to subscribe the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, tho' we have reason to believe they pervert the Sense of these Words? Let Mr. P. produce plain express Scripture to support such a Notion of *Christian Liberty*, and if I find them so express as that I can't return a fair Answer to them, I'll yield the Cause. I don't deny but Mr. P. as he says, p. 37. may have an entire Satisfaction in his *Declaration*. I am apt to think he hath a sort of Satisfaction in most that he says: However, a *Declaration*, of a Complexion with the old *Pagan Oracles*, so easily to be understood different ways, and this from one that is every now and then calling for plain and express Scripture, doth not seem to me so very suitable or justifiable: But Mr. P. had his full Liberty to declare himself as he thought fit.

WHAT I said of the Alteration of the *Collective* Sense of the *Assembly*, that 'twas not made to favour the particular Notions of any of the *Subscribers*

scribers, I still believe 'tis true, and Mr. P. I find hath nothing to say against it. Nor do I see that he is able to prove that it is the Opinion of any, that CHRIST is never call'd the Son of GOD, but meerly upon the Account of his *Incarnation* and *Resurrection*; and if he could prove this, as he hath not done, his Consequence would still be deny'd, because the Argument from the *baptismal Form*, is not only drawn from the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, but from the *Nature* of this *Ordinance*, which, as I observe afterwards, was design'd to be a *Covenant Transaction* between GOD and his Creatures. What we are to understand by these *Terms, Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, we are to learn from other Places of Scripture: And therefore, with Submission to Mr. P. it signifies very much, how all these Divine Persons, the *Father* as well as the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost* as well as either, are represented and spoken of in other Places. In this *Form* they are mention'd according to their usual Titles in the sacred Scriptures; and by what is said of those who bear these Titles in other Places of Scripture, we justly conclude, as also we do from the *Design* of *Baptism*, that the *Father* is GOD, the *Son* GOD, and the *Holy Ghost* GOD, not three Gods, but one God. So that I don't quit the Argument from the *Baptismal Form*, by telling what *Christ* is call'd in another Place. And by telling this, Mr. P. might easily have seen, that I consider the *Son* as GOD, as one that hath the *Divine Nature* and *Perfections* in that *Covenant Transaction* that is at Baptism carried on between GOD and Sinners. The Argument therefore from the *Baptismal Form*, will, I hope, when I come to consider that Matter farther, prove what I design it should prove, and no more.

MR. P. won't allow that the Passages I bring will prove my *Point*. The *Point* that I brought them

them to prove was, that he who is call'd the Son in the *Baptismal Form*, is in other Places so represented, as that we can look upon him as no other than one that is truly and properly GOD. Not a GOD by *Office*, which, as far as I see, is the most that Mr. P. will allow him to be: But a GOD by *Nature*, such a GOD, as no caused, created Being can be. If the Texts I mention signify, that he is such a GOD, the Consequence is clear and undeniable, that he is one God with the Father.

MR. P. supposeth, p. viii. "that it will no more 3 d
 " follow from our Saviour's being call'd *Emmanuel*, that he is one God with the Father, than
 " it will that the Altar is so from its being call'd
 " *Jehovah-Nissi*, Exod. 17 15." It shews, indeed, a good Affection to a Cause, when a Man of Mr. P.'s Sense can content himself with this poor *Soci-
 nian Evasion*. For if the rendring of *Junius* and *Tremellius* be allow'd, it is *Domini Vexilli mei*, i. e. This is the Altar of the Lord my Banner. If this be not granted, the utmost that can be made of this and the like Passages, is, that they are like that of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, figurative Expressions. The altar that *Moses* erected was design'd to perpetuate the Remembrance of that signal Victory that GOD gave the *Israelites* over the *Amalekites*: and accordingly that it might answer this End the better, it was to have, as 'tis conjectur'd with much Probability, this Inscription on it, *Jehovah-Nissi*, the Lord my Banner, or the Lord hath erected a Banner for me. This Inscription on the Altar was to mind the *Israelites* that GOD had wrought out Victory and Salvation for them. It stood by Divine Appointment for much the same as *Dieu & mon Droit*, or anyother Motto of humane Device doth. And if the Passage be thus to be understood, and *El* allow'd, according to Mr. P.'s Argument to signify as much as *Jehovah*;

vah; then the title will prove, that our Saviour is supreme GOD: For it was no other than the Most High GOD, the GOD of *Israel*, that gave Victory to the *Israelites*, and expected a perpetual Tribute of Praise upon that Account: And certainly, we can't without the meanest, and most despicable Thoughts of the great *Emmanuel* say, that he was GOD, just as an Altar of *Wood*, or *Stone*, or *Brass*, was *Jehovah*. And I should be glad to know, with what Truth or Propriety it can be said of one that is GOD only in such a *metaphorical* or improper Sense, that he is *Omnipotent*, *Omniscient*, *Omnipresent*, that all things were made by him, and for him, or as it next follows, that he is God over all, blessed for evermore.

MR. P. I observe, p. 38. doth hardly care to allow, that this Passage is to be understood of our Saviour, and indeed, I can't at all wonder at it, when it is such an irrefragable Proof of his *Supreme Deity*. But I believe he perceiv'd, that to make the Words with Mr. *Whiston* to be an *Echphronema*, and grateful Exclamation for the Blessings conferr'd on the *Jews*, thus, GOD who is over all be blessed for ever; was such a harsh and unnatural Interpretation, and so far from having any thing in Scripture to support it: that he chose to take up with an Interpretation more agreeable to Dr. *Clark*, and to say, "That it can't be strange that he should have this Title of GOD over all given him, to distinguish him from all others that act by a more limited Commission, &c." The Sense then that I make of Mr. P.'s Account of this Text, and the only one, I think, that can be made, if we consider his Quotation from Mr. *Robinson* is, That our Saviour is only a *Titular GOD*, a GOD by Office, a GOD, improperly so called; such a GOD as *Magistrates* and *Angels* are, or as himself as to his humane Nature is, but however
a GOD,

a GOD, that hath a more extensive Commission; and therefore said to be *Θεὸς ἐπὶ πάντων*, or, GOD over all. Now this Title of GOD over all, being one of the highest that is given our Saviour, we may see what *Divinity* it is that Mr. P. is willing to ascribe to him: But that more is signified by this Character than a *Titular GOD*, or a GOD by *Office*, is not only thought by Mr. Robinson *, but concluded from the constant use of the Phrase in other Writings, as well as Scripture.

AMONG the *Heathen Philosophers*, *Θεὸς ἐπὶ πάντων* was their common *Periphrasis* for the Supreme GOD. And I observe, if this *Periphrasis* is at any time us'd by the ancient Writers of the Church concerning the *Father*, and is not at the same time apply'd to the *Son*; that it is presently catch'd at by the Writers against the *Trinity*, and triumph'd in as that which is peculiar to the *Father*: But as this Text shews, that 'tis not peculiar to the *Father*; so in another we find it us'd of the *Father*, and that to denote his being the Supreme God, *Ephes. 4. 6.* To say that it hath one Meaning there, and another here, is a begging the Question. I can see no Reason, unless some other Place can be produc'd where it hath another Signification, why the Phrase should signify one thing in one Place, and another thing in another. The Phrase, as far as I can find, always signifies the *Supreme GOD*: But if it had sometimes another Signification, what immediately follows is a great Confirmation that it is intended to signify so here, *εὐλόγητος εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας ἀμήν*. For this also, *GOD blessed for ever*, is an *Epithet*, or *Periphrasis* apply'd to the Most High GOD. Art thou CHRIST the Son of the Blessed *τῷ εὐλογητῷ*, *Mark 14. 61*? This, it seems, was the

* Doctrine of the Ever Blessed Trinity Stat. &c. p. 26, 27.
known

known Title of the Most High G O D among the *Jews*. And thus we have it us'd by this same Apostle, who, speaking of the Idolatry and Wickedness of the *Heathens*, says, *That they worship'd and serv'd the Creature more than, [or besides] the Creator, who is G O D blessed for evermore, ὅς ἐστιν ἡολύγρωτος ἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν*. The very Phrase here us'd of our Blessed Saviour. And this methinks should put it out of all doubt, that our Saviour is more than a G O D by Office; that he is a great G O D, and a great King above all inferior G O D S. That as he hath the peculiar *Names* and *Titles* of the Most High G O D, so he hath sufficient Essentiality belonging to him to support these *glorious Titles*.

AND whereas Mr. P. says, p. 39. "That 'tis almost natural to suppose that if the Apostle intended to express my Sense, the Words would have been to this Purpose, *Of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came, who, as concerning the Spirit, is G O D over all, blessed for evermore*". I answer, If this will prove my Sense to be the true Sense, the Apostle hath in effect express'd himself as Mr. P. would have him: For when the Apostle shall say, that CHRIST came from the *Jews* according to the *Flesh*; and then add immediately, that he is G O D over all, blessed for evermore; what Sense can we make of this *Limitation*, unless we understand thereby, that he had a higher Nature that did not descend from the *Jews*, in *Vertue* of which, he was G O D over all, blessed for evermore? I don't see but the Apostle's Phrase is as full for my Sense as can be wish'd; and that there was no need to add ὅς τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα, when the *Limitation* according to the *Flesh*, and what immediately follows, must necessarily lead us thus to understand them. It concerns Mr. P. therefore, I think, if he would get over this Proof that our

Saviour

Saviour is Supreme GOD; to shew that these Phrases here apply'd to him, are sometimes apply'd to *Deputy*, and inferior Gods: If this can be prov'd, what I have said upon it must fall, unless it can otherwise be supported: but if this can't be done, this Text will stand as an invincible Proof that our Saviour is the supreme GOD.

AND farther also, I think, that that Text *Isai.* ix. 6. will do the Cause the greatest Service: especially if Mr. P. will allow to be true, what Mr. Gataker, to whom he refers me, says upon it. 'Tis plain that he understood the Text as I do: for he is not only large in confuting the *Jews*, who out of spite to our Saviour, wrest and distort this Text, and apply it to *Hezekiah*; but in speaking of the Characters here given of the great Redeemer, He says as high things of him as any do. Thus, on these Words, [*his Name shall be called wonderful, Counsellor.*] "And how, says he, can he but be deem'd exceeding wonderful, with whom GOD and Man, the divine and human Nature, do in one Person so mysteriously and miraculously concur; that the very Angels themselves, who do therefore adore him, do, amongst other things, admire this in him as a *Mystery* even beyond their reach? *1 Tim.* iii. 16. *Heb.* i. 6." And farther, says he, "As the Words signify a *Wonder of a Counsellor*, so they are not unfitly apply'd to our blessed Saviour, who is so exceedingly strange and wonderful in all his *Counsels* and *Courses*, especially for his People; both in securing them, and defeating the Designs and Attempts of others against them; as no ordinary Phrase or Form is able fitly, much less sufficiently to express it." And farther, says he, "What is spoken of *CHRIST* here, is afterwards deliver'd by the same Prophet, of *GOD*, the Lord *Jehovah*: and for this quotes *Chap.* 28, 29.

ON the next part of his Character, [*the mighty God,*] Mr. Gataker says, "That the Words may be rendred *the mighty God*, or *a mighty God*, (different from what Mr. P. represents it, p. 39.) because there is no other *Article* prefixt to any of his Titles." Mr. P. I think, should have taken Notice of this: and would have reckon'd it unfair in me or another, if we should not: But the reason seems plain why Mr. P. should pass this over; because it sounds too high, to call a *Deputy* inferior God, *the mighty God*. Mr. Gataker was so far from thinking that our blessed Saviour was only a God by *Office*, that on the next Character he says, "That he and the Father, though not one in *Person*, are yet one in *Nature and Essence*." And on this Character of [*the mighty God,*] says farther, "That this Title of mighty God, fitteth well to CHRIST; who hath all the Names of the Deity given him in Scripture: *Adonai, Elohim, Jehovah, God, the true God, or very God, the great God*, the same in Effect with the mighty God here, as join'd together elsewhere, and *God above all to be blessed for ever*": and for this quotes a great many Texts in the old and new Testaments.

'Tis plain, that Mr. P.'s and Mr. Gataker's Notions concerning our Saviour, do differ as much as Darknes and Light: And therefore, I wonder to what end he should refer me to him, or yet to the *Hebrew*; when there is nothing in either but is most agreeable to what I quote this Text for. And tho' it should be allow'd, that our Saviour is call'd the *Father of Eternity*, or the *everlasting Father*, partly on this Account, that he is the Author of eternal Salvation: yet 'tis certain, that 'tis the same Word, viz. *ἔν* here and *Isa. lvii. 15.* where the Word is to be understood, of one that is truly *Eternal*, from everlasting to everlasting, without beginning

beginning or ending. This I hope may satisfy Mr. P. that the learned *Gataker* thought this Text was of great Moment in the present *Controversy*: which I hope will be my Apology for offering so much from this great and good Man; to whom Mr. P. was pleas'd to refer me, as one that had other Sentiments of the Text than I had: but by Examination it appears that we entirely agree. And this is not the first time that Mr. P. hath attempted to give Countenance to his Notions, by the valuable Names of those that do utterly detest them: of which there are some Instances in this Performance, and many more in his *Western Inquisition*. I question very much, whether Mr. P. can as well clear the *Fairness* of this, as I the *Honesty* of those whom he chargeth with a downright *Falsification* in the Addition that was made to the *Assembly's* Resolution. They could have no Design in that Addition, but only to acquaint the World what the Sense of the *Assembly* was. And therefore, if Mr. P. should have taken no Notice of it, as he says he should not, if it had been only to relate the Sense of the *Assembly*, I wonder he should go on to blacken any, when it doth not appear, that they could have any mean and dishonest Design in what they did, yea, when it is so plain and evident that they had not.

I observe throughout Mr. P.'s Answer, that when he hath nothing material to reply to what I offer, then I am charg'd with using a multitude of Words, &c. This is the Method he takes here p. 40. I had said p. 33. that a Letter of Advice relating to the *Trinity*, might be well wrote without inserting therein the Proofs we had to support the Doctrine we would have them persist in the Profession of: and especially, when such a Letter was directed to those, that had their *Bibles* and other Helps by them, to establish and confirm

them in the Faith; and these much better than we could be suppos'd to lay before them, in the little time we had together. Mr. P. can't say, but this was reason sufficient to excuse Us, from laying the Proofs of our Faith before our People. And when I had given this as a Reason, for writing such a Letter as we did: he should have shewn, I think, that such a Reason could not justify us; and that giving Advice in any Case, without offering the Reasons of that Advice, is absurd and ridiculous. Mr. P. hath offer'd nothing of this kind to convince me that it is so: but hath unwarily, I suppose, own'd, *p. 40.* that we did not go, as at other times we are represented, upon groundless *Jealousies*; but that there was a *real Controversy* sprung up among us: tho' Mr. P. hath said, *p. 6.* that they move no *Controversy* with us about the *Trinity*. We had indeed, if Mr. P. had not own'd it now, too many melancholly Proofs that it was so: and had reason to apprehend, that some of our People, by the restless Endeavours that were us'd, might be in danger of being corrupted. And therefore, if we could do any thing to prevent it, by our joint *Advice* and declar'd *Unanimity*, when things were brought to such an unhappy *Crisis*; it can't be deny'd, but we acted just as Persons in our Stations were oblig'd to do. And what occasion could there be to enter upon such a Proof of our Notions as Mr. P. thinks necessary, when some of our worthy Brethren in *London* had been so happily engag'd in this Matter but just before? This we knew: Many of us had seen their excellent Performance: All had heard of it: and we knew it was in the Hands of some of our People, and would by our means be in the Hands of more in a little time.

BUT without such Reasons as are there offer'd to strengthen our Advice, I don't see but what I offer'd

offer'd concerning the *Scriptural Epistles*, is very far from doing me the least Disservice; tho' it seems I have much oblig'd Mr. P. thereby. By offering this, Mr. P. says, "I must doubtless mean, we have follow'd his Example, in expecting to be believ'd upon our own Authority." But had Mr. P. before he had pass'd his Censure, regarded as he ought what I said, p. 34. viz. that I don't pretend to compare our Letter with St. John's Epistle; the least degree of Candour must have led him to own, that doubtless I had not, nor could have any such meaning as he speaks of. But this I suppose is studiously overlook'd, the better to make way for his following *Banter* and *Ridicule*; which, as far as I perceive, can expose no Body but himself. That which I mention'd the *Scriptural Epistles* for, was to shew, that tho' the Advice of those that sent them, is sometimes back'd with the proper Reasons to establish what they urge, yet sometimes it is not; and this tho' it did concern all; as well those that did not believe their *Infallibility* and *Inspiration*, as those that did. And this is the Case in this particular *Epistle*, where the Apostle doth caution Persons against *Deceivers* and *Antichrists*, and such as did not abide in the *Doctrine of Christ*; which I can't but take to be the very Case of many among us. This render'd it a piece of Charity and Justice in us, to advise Persons in such perilous Times, to look to themselves. And if there should be any such amongst our selves as Mr. P. speaks of, p. 41. (which I very much question) our Advice, which was general, must take in all *Corrupters* of Faith of this kind; and therefore this among the rest. For my own part, as I know that the *Controversy* is not about *Subscribing* and *Non-subscribing*; but about the *Faith*, as Mr. P. is forc'd to own: So I shall have nothing to say for any *Subscriber* that corrupts the Faith.

And

And if there be any *Non-Subscriber*, that I have the least reason to think doth not, I shall have nothing to say against him. I can't help being of that side, where I take the Truth to be: 'Tis for this reason, I am among the *Subscribers*: where I know of no such Person, or Errors as Mr. P. speaks of.

Mr. P. I hope will forgive me, if I thought that his *Remarks*, about the Papists sending Letters at the *Reformation*, deserv'd no other Reply than what I gave 'em. Nor doth Mr. P. at all help me to see that I was out in my Conjecture, but rather confirms me in it. He is very much mistaken in thinking, that I ridicule a *Reformation*. No, I am sensible that there are a great many things that want it: Nor am I without hope, that Christ will in time *thoroughly purge his own Floor*; and not suffer so much Error, and Pride, and Passion, and Bitterness, &c. to obtain in the World as now there do. But though I abhor the Thoughts of ridiculing a *Reformation*; and should particularly be very glad, if there were no *Capital Errors*, or any crude and unguarded Expressions about the *Trinity*: Yet I can't but dislike a positive, dogmatical way of expounding dark and intricate *Prophecies*: and especially, when I find, how the most confident have been mistaken. And particularly, I do then dislike it most; when such Expositions do any way byass Men, to fall in with new *Schemes of Religion*; as an *Accomplishment* of these *Prophecies*, and as a great *Confirmation* that these Expositions are true. I can't find, by observing the present State of Affairs either here or abroad, that Mr. P. hath any great reason to boast of his *Inquiries*. There was scarce ever more *Atheism*, *Infidelity*, *Scorning at Religion*, and *Wickedness* among us, or in other Places than there is at present. And how the
Notions

Notions lately sprung up, should give him any Occasion to be so sanguine, I can't tell: when 'tis known, that some have sprung up almost in every Age, that have one way or other oppos'd the Divinity of our Saviour, and the Holy Ghost. I can't look upon this as any new Discovery of the present Age; or that any thing hath been offer'd to overthrow this Part of our Common Christianity, but what was offer'd long before. And therefore, how this should satisfy Mr. P. as he seems to intimate it hath, that he is not widely out in his Expectations, I can't tell. We are got almost Four Years beyond 1716, and yet are so far from a Reformation, that there was scarce ever so much Corruption as there is now: The *Votaries of Atheism, Infidelity and Wickedness* did scarce ever seem to be so numerous and daring, as they are in our Days.

WHAT Persecution it is, that Mr. P. hath seen practis'd so much by those of my Opinion, I don't understand. Nor do I know, that he is become more obnoxious than Dr. Clark, or Mr. Whiston; who have laid their Names, with their Notions, before the World. He hath but little Reason to suppose, "that the most innocent Expressions in the World, may be made a Handle of giving him trouble:" when those that he must know to be very obnoxious, and even contrary to the Law, have not. He hath said, that the Father is God, and the Son God; and yet that they are never spoken of in Scripture as the one God. And what is this but to say, that there are more Gods than one; contrary to the express Letter of the Law, as is also his denying the Godhead of the Holy Ghost? * Though Mr. P. hath said

* Vid. Stat. against Blasph. 3, 10 King William the third.

this, and a great deal more; yet he hath not been prosecuted; and I hope won't. What of his Notions he hath laid before the World in his Answer to me, I have consider'd: and what he may farther offer, I shall consider. And particularly, if I knew that the Twenty Propositions lately Printed about the *Trinity*, in an Anonymous Letter to my self, were Mr. P.'s, whereas I have now contented my self to obviate the most material Things that occur in them, I would consider them distinctly. But why I should write against every nameless unknown Author, I don't understand: Or why, when my present Business lies with Mr. P. I should any otherwise vindicate the Doctrine of the Trinity than I have, I don't see the Reason. If Mr. P. will let me know what Scheme it is, whether the *Arian* or *Socinian* that he sticks to; that I may know what I have to vindicate or write against, I shall attend him: But till I know this, I shall only vindicate the common Notion from the occasional Opposition that is made thereto. Mr. P. and his Friends I look upon as the *Aggressors*, and therefore as they have set up for a *Reformation* of Religion, so they ought to vindicate what they advance. I shall have reason to wait, till I see what part of the Doctrine I am farther to defend; and then I shall cheerfully do my best.

Mr. P. had so often spoken so very contemptuously of the Argument drawn from the *Baptismal Form* for the Proof of the receiv'd Notion, that no one can blame me: that to check this Temper, I put him in Mind, that there were Persons not inferior to himself, who laid great stress as well as the *Assembly* upon this Argument: and particularly, I instanc'd in Bishop *Burnet*; who, I think, talks admirably well upon that Head. Mr. P. says, that the Reasoning here used doth not satisfy.

I am

I am far from wondring that it doth not; for if it did, he must necessarily give up his *New Scheme*, and return to his *old Notions*, and Friends. That which I would desire of Mr. P. seeing he is not satisfy'd, is to answer, whether by Baptism; (if rightly qualified for that Solemnity) we are not, as Bishop *Burnet* says, receiv'd from a *State* of Sin and Wrath, into a *State* of Favour; and into the Rights of the Sons of God, and the Hopes of eternal Happiness: And whether these are not Things of that Nature, that they can't be offer'd and assur'd to Men in any other Name than that of the great and eternal God. 'Tis very evident, I think, from Scripture; and particularly, from those Accounts that the other *Evangelists* give of the *Commission* that Christ gave his Disciples after his Resurrection, that there are none that come duly prepar'd to this Solemnity of Baptism; but are assur'd hereby, that they shall be pardon'd and sav'd, unless they break Covenant with God; and this Assurance is given them in the Name of all those glorious Persons, whose Disciples they were really before Baptism, and by Baptism own themselves to be. Thus St. *Luke*, speaking of what did pass between Christ and his Disciples, after his Resurrection, says, *Ch. xxiv. v. 47.* that Christ gave them in Charge, *to preach Repentance and Remission of Sins in his Name.* Repentance, as previous to Baptism in adult Persons, and Remission; as the certain and most desirable Consequence of it; of which all might be assur'd by being baptiz'd in his Name. St. *Mark*, in the Account that he gives us of the same Matter, *ch. xvi. v. 14, 15, 16.* says, that after Christ had appear'd to the Eleven, and upbraided them with their Unbelief and Hardness of Heart; he said unto them, *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature; he that believeth and is baptiz'd, shall be*

K

Saved.

Saved. Such Believers have a sure and unquestionable Title to eternal Salvation, and this seal'd and assur'd to them in *Baptism* by the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, into whose Name they are baptiz'd. And this seems to be the meaning of what *St. John* says, *John* xx. 23. *Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd.* The *Apostles* were to judge of the *Repentance* and *Faith* of those that they admitted to *Baptism*; and so to declare them pardon'd or unpardon'd, according to the Terms of the Gospel as they saw Occasion. And what the *Faith* was that the *Apostles* were to expect, and others to exercise in our blessed *Saviour*, *St. John* tells us in the Case of *Thomas*; viz. that they were to believe in *CHRIST* as their *LORD* and *GOD*, v. 28. not as another God, but the same in *Essence* with the *Father*. This was evidently the *Faith* that *St. Thomas* had; and which, according to our *Saviour*, v. 29. he was to have; and therefore that, which he himself was to insist on in those that he should admit to *Baptism*, and thereby assure of Pardon.

By these several Accounts, when put together, and consider'd with the Baptismal Form and Commission, *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. we see the full extent of the *Apostles* Commission, in reference to such as were by *Baptism* to be admitted into the Christian Church. They were to press all Unbelievers to *Repentance* and *Faith*, as the indispensable Conditions of their being pardon'd and sav'd. And if they gave such Proofs of their *Repentance* and *Faith* as were satisfactory, they were to assure them of Pardon and Salvation in the Name of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, and so baptize them. And that the *Apostles* thus understood their Commission, and executed it accordingly, seems plain from the Accounts that we have in the *Acts* of
the

the Apostles. Thus when the *Jews* were under the utmost Consternation because of their Sin in crucifying the Lord of Life and Glory, St. Peter upon their Application to him for Direction what to do: *Repent*, says he, *and be baptiz'd every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost, Acts ii. 38.* and it follows, *v. 41. that then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized.* We have much the same Account of this Matter in the Case of the *Eunuch*, the *Jaylor*, and *St. Paul*. We find that *Philip* would not admit the *Eunuch*, (whom I take to be a Jewish *Profelyte*) to *Baptism*, as a Person qualify'd for the Blessings assur'd thereby, unless he believed with all his Heart: But when he declar'd, *that he believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of GOD; they went down to the Water and he was baptiz'd, and went on his way rejoicing; as one that was washed, and sanctified, and justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of GOD.* And the Reason, I apprehend, why there is not a more exprels Notice taken here and elsewhere, of the *Father* and *Holy Ghost*, is, because the *Jews* and their *Profelytes* did already believe, as *Dr. Whitby* observes, "in God the *Father*, and in the *Holy Ghost*; and profess Obedience to the Laws of *GOD*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, speaking by the *Mouth of his Prophets.*" And tho' they believ'd in the *Son* also, yet in our Saviour as that divine Person or Messiah that should come into the World, they did not; and therefore in the Baptisms of the *Jews*, this was expressly requir'd. Thus the *Jaylor*, when under the utmost Concern about his Salvation, *St. Paul* assures him, *that if he believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, he should be saved with his House.* This he did, and was baptized, *he and all his straightway.* And then as a Person assur'd of his being interested in the divine Favour, *he rejoiced*

believing in GOD, or the Lord Jesus as his GOD, with all his House, Acts xvi. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. And so St. Paul himself, when he came to Ananias under Conviction for his Guilt in opposing our blessed Saviour, that which Ananias advis'd him to was, *that he should arise without Delay, and be baptiz'd, and wash away his Sins, calling upon the Name of the Lord*, Acts xxii. 16. The Meaning of which, I think with Mr. Baxter, is evidently this; "Delay not, but presently repent and believe in CHRIST, and give up thy self to him in his baptismal Covenant; and as the Water washeth this Body; his pardoning Grace, thro' the Merits of his Blood and Righteousness, shall wash away the Guilt of thy Sins." And farther, 'tis observable that he was to shew himself a sincere Christian, *by calling upon the Name of the Lord*; the same Lord that had said unto him, *I am Jesus whom thou persecutest*: who, unless he had been the Lord his GOD, Ananias would never have advis'd to so absurd and wicked a Thing, as to call upon his Name.

THERE are several other things of the like Nature that occur in Scripture concerning *Baptism*: But from these, I think, 'tis sufficiently clear, that at *Baptism* there is a *Covenant* ratified between the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and those that are admitted thereto. On our part it is requir'd, that we, besides other things, believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; That we own them as our Creator, Redemer and Sanctifier; or as the one living and true GOD, that doth create, redeem and sanctifie, and who alone is able to pardon and make us happy. And those that do this heartily, and sincerely, GOD doth by this *Sacrament* assure, that they shall be pardoned, justified, and saved. This, I think, is the true and just Representation that the Scripture gives us of that Covenant

Covenant, that at *Baptism* is establish'd between GOD and us. We are at *Baptism* devoted to the *Faith* and *Service* of the one GOD, and assur'd by him of those Blessings that we need, as Men and Sinners.

AND this Account of *Baptism* is not at all contradicted, but rather confirm'd, by two of those Texts of *Scripture* that Mr. P. refers us to for the Explication of *Baptism*. As for that of being baptiz'd into *Moses*, which is the poor Refuge of the *Arians* and *Socinians*, to evade the Argument drawn from the *Baptismal Form* for the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*; as it hath no Reference at all, that I see, to our *Baptism*; so I can't find that *Expositors* are agreed what this *Baptism* was. We have no *Footsteps* of its Institution, or Design; nor any reason to believe, that it was a solemn *Rite* appointed by GOD to engage Persons to be *Moses's* Disciples. So that, the Place it self being so very obscure, it can't help us to understand the *Baptismal Commission*. Nor can this Passage help the Gentlemen at all; unless they were able to produce some other, wherein the *Jews* were order'd to be baptiz'd in the Name of GOD, and in the Name of *Moses* at the same time; and by the same *Rite*, and without any Distinction, just as Christians now are. This indeed would shew, that GOD and a Creature may be join'd in the same *federal Rite*, and that the greatest Blessings may be offer'd in their Name: but I don't find any thing like this in *Scripture*. As to that Passage, 1 *Cor.* i. 13, 15. the *Apostle* doth not only suggest, that they were not baptiz'd in his Name; but intimates also, that they ought not, and that it would be very sinful if they were. *Was Paul crucify'd for you, or were ye baptiz'd in the Name of Paul? I thank God I baptiz'd none of you, &c.* Which is, as if he should have said, was I ever so arrogant

arrogant and wicked, as to pretend to be the Redeemer of the Church, so as that it should be call'd by my Name? Did I ever assume the Authority of baptizing any in my own Name? Did I ever set up for the Head of the Church, or expect that any should be devoted to my Service? Did I ever pretend to assure any of Pardon and Salvation in my Name? No, I abhor all such Pretences, as *blasphemous Incroachments* upon the Authority of CHRIST. 'Tis peculiar to GOD to redeem and sanctify, to pardon and save, and therefore I abhor the Thoughts of baptizing any in my own Name. There is none besides this GOD, that Persons should venture to own as their Head: and therefore what is said among you is very unreasonable, *that I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, &c.* This, I think, is the *Apostle's* Argument. We own Him for our Head, our Saviour, and our God; we expect all the Blessings that we want from Him, in whose Name we are baptiz'd, and by whose Name we are called. 'Twould therefore be wicked and absurd for any to say, *I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas*: yea, it would be wicked to say this of CHRIST himself; if he was no more than a *Man*, and the *Ringleader* of a particular *Sett*, as some did blasphemously take him to be. What therefore the *Apostle* offers, doth, I think, strengthen the Argument for our Saviour's Divinity from the Baptismal Form: for it represents CHRIST as the sole Head of the Church, *which is the Church of the living GOD.*

IN the Sacrament of *Baptism* then, there is an Oath of *Fidelity* and *Allegiance* taken, which none can have a Right to claim but the great GOD. And farther, there are Blessings assur'd, that none can, or hath to bestow but the same GOD: And when this is done, as I think it is, notwithstanding any thing Mr. P. hath said, without any *Distinction*,

distinction, or Note of *Inequality*; I think the Conclusion is undeniable, that they must be all three the true GOD.

BUT it imports, as Mr. P. says, p. 44. an Inequality that CHRIST says, *All Power is given me in Heaven and Earth*. But if we duly consider what is here said of our blessed Saviour, and compare it with what is said to the same Purpose in another Place, we shall the more easily perceive, that this is not a Note of *Inequality*; Nor such a Gift as detracts from the *supreme Honour and Dignity* of our blessed Saviour. The very thing that is said of our blessed Saviour shews, that he is GOD most high. *All Power is given me in Heaven and Earth*. But now, can any be fit for the Exercise of such an *absolute, supreme, unlimited Power*, but the supreme GOD? Is it not peculiar to the supreme GOD to search all Hearts? to know all things? *to do whatsoever he pleaseth both in the Armies of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth*? Can any guide and govern, protect and defend, sanctifie and save, kill and make alive, dispose of, and judge all Mankind, but the great *Creator and Sovereign* of the World? Are not these things always spoken of in Scripture, as the *Province and Prerogative* of the most high GOD? As therefore these and the like things are manifestly included in the Power that is said to be given to our blessed Saviour; and are in other Places of Scripture particularly ascrib'd to him; so, I think, what is said to be given, must be so understood, as not to denote any *Inferiority of Nature or Perfections*. And this may very well be understood, if we consider what is said, *John v. 22. viz. That the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed, or given all Judgment to the Son*. The sole Administration of all Affairs, relating to the Church and World, is now in his Hands. And this must be to speak

ſpeak in our Language, and according to our Apprehenſions, as by Donation. The *natural* and *original Right*, that our Saviour hath to govern the Creation, is in *Conjunction* with the *Father* and *Holy Ghoſt* : But the *ſole Adminiſtration* which is now in his Hands, and that as *God-man* muſt be by Conſent, and may without any other Impro- priety than what is uſual, when ſuch ſublime things are to be accommodated to our Apprehenſions, be ſtil'd a Gift:

As things now ſtand, our Saviour is *Head over all things to the Church*. He claims it as his peculiar Prerogative to enact Laws; to appoint Ordinances, and Officers; to appoint how all his Subjects ſhall regulate their Conduct: How they ſhall manage as to the Matter and Manner of their Worſhip; and what ſort of Officers, whether extraordinary or ordinary, ſhall officiate under him. We read of *Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts*, that *they are his Gift*, *Ephes. iv. 11*. 'Tis our Saviour that puts us on Work: that will be with us and others to the end of the World, to aſſiſt and encourage them and us in it. 'Tis he that obſerves our Conduct; that will call us to an Account; and reward and puniſh us, as it ſhall appear that we have been faithful or unfaithful in diſcharging the Truſt repos'd in us. Theſe are things that do properly belong to the great GOD, *Father, Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*: but are deliver'd or given into the Hands of CHRIST; which evidently ſhews him to be, not an inferior, ſubordinate Perſon. And it deſtroys al' our diſtinguiſhing Notions of GOD and his Creatures; to ſay, that any is fit for ſuch a *Province*, but the ſupreme GOD. If it be allow'd, that one that is not GOD ſupreme, can make, uphold, govern, and judge ſuch a World as this; I don't ſee but he may as well make and govern another, and ſo on *ad infinitum*: ſo that every thing

thing conceivable, may with the same Reason be allow'd unto him; and consequently that the same things may be said of one that is not supreme God, as of one that is. And what higher things are said in Scripture of God, than that he made and governs, that he redeemed, and will hereafter judge the World? As then, in the *Form of Baptism* it self, there is nothing like a Note of *Inequality* between the *Father* and *Son*; so neither is there in these Words, *all Power is given me.*

As to the *Inequality* of the *Holy Ghost*, Mr. P. owns, p. 44. that there is no Note of *Inequality* express'd in the *Baptismal Form*: but says, that it is sufficiently imply'd. But this, like other things, is rather taken for granted, than prov'd. Nor is it, I think, true, that the Scripture never speaks of this Power as given by the *Holy Ghost*. The contrary I take to be clear from that of our Saviour himself, *Luke iv. 18, 19. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor; He hath sent me to heal the Broken-hearted, to preach Deliverance to the Captives, &c.* Here the Commission that CHRIST had to act as *Prophet, Priest, and King*, is spoken of as granted by the *Holy Ghost*: So that 'tis in his Name, as well as the *Father's*, that Sinners are treated with about the Concerns of their eternal Salvation. Nor doth the Text that Mr. P. brings, make any thing against the Argument, but rather confirms it, if it should be allow'd, as 'tis not by all, that it belongs to Baptism. *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, &c.* Tho' here be a Distinction, yet there is no *Inequality*. For what higher thing is there in our Salvation, than *Redemption, and Sanctification*; which are here ascrib'd to the *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*? As to the Order in which they are mention'd, this will prove nothing; or at most but a *Priority of Order*, but

not of *Essence*. And besides, we find in Scripture that the *Son* is sometimes mention'd before the *Father*; and the *Holy Ghost* here before the *Son*; so that nothing certain can be concluded from this. The Argument then from the *Baptismal Form*, will bear, I think, the utmost Stress that is laid upon it: For this Reason I have handled it largely, and I wish it may be to Mr. P.'s Satisfaction.

I had reason to be surpriz'd that Mr. P. should say, "That believing the Scripture is not sufficient, unless Men believe as the Church believes." For can he say with any *Face* or *Truth*, that to supply the Defects of Scripture, we have Recourse to *Authentick Traditions*, as the *Papists* have? or that CHRIST hath constituted any *infallible Interpreter*, on whose Judgment and Honesty we are to depend for the Interpretation of Scripture; and that we are to be thrown into a Goal if we can't assent thereto? The most that we say is, that the Words of Scripture have their Sense and Signification; or else, that they could be no *Rule of Faith* and *Manners* either to Mr. P. or us. And farther we say, that every Christian, and especially every Minister, must endeavour to fix the Sense of Scripture, that it may be a Rule to himself; and that he may be able to govern his own Conduct thereby. And if others can't agree with him, they ought to have their *Liberty* to put such an Interpretation upon Scripture as they think best. Is there any thing like this among the *Papists*? If not, how then do we and the *Papists* agree? And can Mr. P. find out so good a way, at once to secure the *Liberty* of *Christians*, and the *Honesty* of *Ministers* and *Christian Societies*, in admitting Persons into the Church? Must we throw aside all Examination, and admit all to the Ministry and Sacraments without Distinction? Would this be to act like Persons that have any regard to Religion; or like those

those that must hereafter give an Account? And fain would I know, where it is that the Scripture hath directed us to such a Management.

MR. P. may go on to call this *Popery* and *Imposition*, and departing from Protestant Principles, &c. But these are only frightful Words to work upon the Passions of well-meaning Christians; and he may as well say, that there are no *Protestants* in the World. We impose not on Mr. P. or any Body else; only we can't help thinking, that he hath wrested the Scriptures, and taken up with Notions that are most contrary to them: and therefore if he was now to be ordain'd, we could not, I think, ordain him with a good Conscience, and without suffering our selves to be impos'd upon. And I would put it to Mr. P. whether he himself could, if he had the same Notions of the *Trinity* that we have? And whether he does not think, there are such Truths in Scripture as Ministers ought to insist on as necessary to be believ'd, and to qualify Persons for the Ministry? 'Twon't, I think, here excuse him, to say, that these Truths must be plain and important: For even these Truths that he allows to be such, mayn't appear to be such to other Persons. Besides, we think, that the receiv'd Doctrine of the *Trinity* is such; and that we can't depart from it, without doing the utmost Dishonour to our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier*, and setting up Creature Worship in the Church. And this we don't believe, because others believe it; and so are not chargeable with an *Implicit Faith*: But we believe it, because we think 'tis clear from Scripture. If Mr. P. hath different Thoughts, we leave him to his Thoughts; but can't help concluding, as long as we take our selves to be in the Right, that he of Consequence must be in the Wrong. And if he will go on to call this Proceeding against him, Imposing upon him, and Quarrelling with him;

the Language, all must allow, to be new and unsuitable; but the Charge we have no reason to be ashamed of. How Mr. P. did declare his Faith, I have already observ'd. 'Twas such a Declaration, perhaps, as no one would have made, that had any Inclination to be understood.

I had observ'd, in my Answer, that the Method of some, in confining themselves to Scripture Expressions, was taken up of late; and therefore very probably to serve a *Turn*: and that before Mr. *Whiston* and Dr. *Clark* reviv'd *Arianism*, they were wont to speak as others did. Mr. P. I take Notice, doth not deny, that this Change is to serve a *Turn*: but denies, that Dr. *Clark* hath reviv'd *Arianism*; and tells me, he doth not like me the better that I charge him therewith. He would, perhaps, have said the same of Mr. *Whiston*, if he had not frankly and honestly own'd it. I am very easy to believe, that Mr. P. doth not like me the better for the Charge that I bring against Dr. *Clark*. I know very well he dislikes the Name; and should be very glad if he did as much dislike the thing. I can't see, however, that Mr. P. hath so much reason to be offended; that I, after others who must be allow'd to be sufficient Judges of what is *Arianism*, and what not, should speak as I do concerning Dr. *Clark*. For doth not he expressly say, "That our Saviour derives his Being from the *Father*, as from the supreme Cause?" * If the *Father* be the Cause of the *Son*, the *Son* can be no other than the Effect of this Cause: And how there can be an Effect that is not a Creature, that is not ἐξ ὧν ὄντων, which is what the *Arians* constantly affirm'd of our Saviour, Dr. *Clark* hath not told: and I should be glad if his Friend

* Script. Doct. p. 270.

Mr. P. can. But farther, doth not Dr. *Clark* say,
 “ That the *Son* deriv’d his Being from the *Father*,
 “ by an Act of the *Father’s* incomprehensible
 “ Power and Will?” * Now, I think, ’tis the
 very *Soul* of *Arianism*, thus to say, that the *Son*
 is the *voluntary Production* of the *Father*. What
 can the Expression import less, than that *Christ* is
 a *meer Creature*? That there was a time when he
 was not? and that if it had pleas’d the *Father*, he
 might not have been? I don’t see but the whole
Drift of Dr. *Clark’s* Book, is to shew that the
Son is not of the same *Essence* with the *Father*.
 Nor can I see, according to his Principles, but
 that there must be a time when he was not: And
 if this be not *Arianism*, I should be glad to be in-
 form’d what is; and must endeavour to be easy
 under Mr. P.’s Displeasure till that time.

I shall be very glad, if it appear that Mr. P. and
 Brethren, as he suggests, p. 46. have a greater Ve-
 neration for Scripture than they had formerly:
 but they must, in my Opinion, give some better
 Proof of it, than to use it as a *Cloak* to hide their
 Notions. And whatever Mr. P. may insinuate,
 that we han’t such a Regard for them as we ought;
 ’tis, I am sure, no Argument of it, that we en-
 deavour to understand the Meaning of the *Holy*
Ghost in them, and then lay it before the World;
 either to be follow’d or not, as Persons see Reason.
 This, I know, is to do what Christians have done
 in all Ages, and none more than those that have
 sacrific’d their Lives for the Religion of their *Bibles*.
 And when all is done, I can’t see but it argues
 a greater Respect for the *Scriptures*, to stick to its
 Words, and declare their Meaning; than barely to
 stick to Scripture Expressions, without any deter-

* Script. Doc. 2^d. Edit. p. 246.

minate Sense or Signification. And how a Minister can do this, with a Conscience that can afford him any Satisfaction, who is to be the Helper of the *Faith* and *Holiness* of his People, I don't understand. Such, I think, should *declare the whole Counsel of God*: which they can't do by a bare reading the Scriptures to them, without giving their Sense. And if their People don't understand the Scriptures aright, they should help them, if able; and they are inexcusable if they do not. For which reason, I presume, it would not be amiss if Mr. P. would look back upon his past Conduct as to this Matter.

'Tis so disagreeable to me to say any thing that may be grating of any Person, that nothing, but such Expressions as carry an *Air* of the utmost *Contempt* of all other Persons, can easily move me to it. And whether what Mr. P. says *, are not of this kind, I leave the Reader to judge. He says there, "That we prudently consider'd, that the wisest Course was, for Men to judge before they hear us, and know what we say. The hearing us without doubt would have been dangerous; and therefore all the warm and moving Expressions which their Invention suggested, are turn'd to raise an Indignation against us." Can any thing be made of these Expressions, but that Mr. P. hath all the Sense on his side; and we, and our People, nothing but *Passion* and *Prejudice* on ours? That the Reason why we did not hear him, was, because we were afraid of his superior Reason and Abilities. If this be not his Meaning, I beg his Pardon; but his Expressions were such, as led me thus to understand them. And it looks, as if I was not much mistaken, by what he says, *Ans. p. 46, 47.*

* Remarks. p. 22.

“ He says, we have encourag’d a Prejudice in the
 “ People against him and his Brethren, without
 “ being able to charge them with any thing that’s
 “ Criminal.” The Meaning certainly must be,
 what is Criminal, or rather Erroneous in their own
 Judgment, but not in ours. We have a great ma-
 ny things of this Nature to charge upon them, if
 there was Occasion: as particularly, that our Savi-
 our is no more than a God by *Office*. That he is
 not only subordinate to the Father, but a voluntary
 Production of the Father. That after the Day of
 Judgment he’ll cease to be God. That no other
 Worship is due to our *Saviour*, but what is subor-
 dinate, and by the Gift of the *Father*; and such as
 might be paid to other inferior Beings, if there was
 a Command. That he is in every thing inferior
 to the *Father*, and no more than a Creature.

THESE Notions, so very shocking to most
 Christians Ears, tho’ they mayn’t be Criminal in
 Mr. P.’s Account, they are so in ours. And we
 are able to prove, if it would be of any Service,
 that some, or all of these, were once the Notions
 of those that are so angry with us. But I won-
 der Mr. P. won’t understand, that it was not our
 Business to prove this upon any; when ’tis plain,
 we did not take upon us to censure any: and what
 we did was perfectly unexceptionable without it.
 Had we pass’d Sentence upon any particular Person,
 we ought, according to the *Apostle’s Rule*, to have
 heard the Witnesses: But seeing we did not, I don’t
 see how we can be said to transgress it. And if
 we had, I don’t see why this should hinder Mr. P.
 or any other, from satisfying the People whom
 they had disgusted. I think rather, that this should
 be a Motive to clear their Innocence, if they had
 been able: But this they very well knew they could
 not do to the Peoples Satisfaction.

I had

I had said in my Answer, that the *Subordination* that Mr. P. &c. pleads for, is a *Subordination* as to *Nature, Essence, and all Perfections*. This Mr. P. I find can't deny: and yet won't own the Consequence I draw from it, *viz.* that such a *Subordination* brings down our Saviour to a *Level* with the *Creature*. "This Consequence, says he, "I have deny'd," and then warmly enough puts the Question, "What have any to do to charge "me with it?" But I would beg leave to ask Mr. P. whether this be not a *natural and necessary Consequence*? Whether it be not as evident, as that it is Day because the Sun shineth? Whether we have clearer Ideas of any thing than this, that what is not uncreated, and God, must necessarily be created, and infinitely less than God? And that if the *Father* alone be the one God, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* cannot be God; but must necessarily be the *Works, the Effects, or Creatures* of this first Cause, or Creator? I think, if Mr. P. or any other would deny Consequences, they should not lay down Positions, from which nothing but such Consequences will follow. And if these be not Mr. P.'s own Thoughts, and especially in Reference to the *Holy Ghost*, why should he refuse to give him Glory? I know he says, "We have no "Direction, or Example for it in Scripture." Surely he can't mean, that we have no Direction to give Glory to God; or to ascribe Honour and Glory for our being *washed, and sanctified, and justified, which is said to be done in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. vi. 11.* I think it is most evident from Scripture, that we ought to ascribe the Glory of our Sanctification, to the *Author* of our Sanctification. That if it be the Spirit's Work to transform our Souls, he ought to have the Glory of his own Work.

Nor

Nor can I see, how any will be able to excuse it to the great Sanctifier and Comforter of Souls; if it be not thus.

MR. P. says, p. 48. "We can't charge him " with delivering this, supposing it to be an Error." But I think to refuse to do this himself, and not to suffer others to do it, who thought it their Duty, is, to deliver it with Circumstances of Aggravation: and is such a *flagrant Imposition*, as should never be practic'd by any; and much less by one that sets up as the *Patron of Liberty*. We very well knew, that Mr. P. was guilty both of the *Error* and *Imposition*: But as we have set up no *Tribunal* to judge him or any other Body, so we had no need to call Witnesses. We had but too many, if there had been but the least Occasion. As to what Mr. P. says of a *Subscriber*, p. 48. I must beg leave to suspect his Information: because, all that I know of them have more Sense, and more Honesty than to subscribe the first *Article*, whilst this is their Notion. But if Mr. P. doth suspect what I have said, I'll venture, if there be Occasion, to name the Persons; and appeal to himself and others for the Truth of what I charge upon them.

MR. P. says farther, p. 48. "That I seem to " think I had an Advantage, because he had not " declar'd against the Authors cited in our Letter;" whose Notions plainly are, that there are *three Gods*, one Supreme, and two Subordinate. I freely own, that I did think so, and can't help thinking so still; that he hath adopted these Notions as his own: and that the Reason why he did not manifest any Dislike of what these Authors say, was, because he could not. If he could, he might have done it as a piece of Justice to his own Credit and Reputation; tho' not out of Complaisance to the *Assembly*. If he had not Generosity enough to return Good for Evil, that he supposeth the *Assembly*

M

have

have done him; he might have taken Notice, that it was not to gratify the *Assembly*, but to oblige himself: But that he should be so angry with the *Assembly*, as not to be mindful of his own Reputation, if he thought this to be concern'd, would seem a little strange in another, if not in Mr. P. But his Answer to me puts it out of all doubt, that the Suspicion that many had of his agreeing with those Authors, was very just. That what I offer'd him from his own Answer to Mr. Jackman, was not improperly urg'd; and that 'twas not so much to shew his *Contempt* of the *Assembly*, that he did not attempt to clear himself of what we are forc'd to think is *Herefy*; as, because he could not do it fairly and with Honour. And yet, if it had been only to shew his *Contempt* of the *Assembly*, 'tis what I think he hath no great Reason to glory in.

I can't think, but I have made it abundantly evident, p. 39. that what the Author of the Letter to a Dissenter says, amounts fully to what we charge upon him, or rather more: and that therefore nothing like Injury is done to that unknown Gentleman, or his Notions misrepresented. If an *Exc.* had been added, which would have serv'd as well as the citing of more Pages, Mr. P. might have call'd such a *Correction* a *Forgery*, as well as what he hath: But such Terms are forborn in *civil Language*, and where Persons don't shew a Forwardness to aggravate beyond all Proportion.

If I say, that these Errors that Mr. P. mentions, are not prevailing among the *Subscribers*; I am pretty sure I do it upon better Grounds than he doth the contrary. We could not be appriz'd that these Errors did prevail: because, I verily believe 'tis not true in *Fact*, nor ever was. I don't know so much as one of the *Subscribers* that is chargeable with them; nor one of our Congregations that is

in the least Danger of being tainted with them. If Mr. P. knows the contrary, he is concern'd for the sake of *Truth*, and the Prevention of *Blasphemy* to oppose them: and not to do so, either in Concurrence with the *Assembly*, or without, does not argue the greatest Concern for the Interest of Religion. And if Mr. P. knows these things to be true, which I don't; I can't account for it that he should not write: when every Body knows how forward he hath been to write when there hath been less Occasion. 'Tis sufficient in the *Assembly*, to discountenance Errors that are known to be among us. If Mr. P. knows of any thing that we do not; he ought, as a Servant of *Christ* and *Truth*, to appear against them. 'Tis a groundless Uncharitableness to suggest, as Mr. P. doth, that the *Assembly* were acted by a Spirit of *Revenge*: or that we have the Faith of God; or as the Apostle, *the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ the Lord of Glory, with Respect of Persons*. To shew that we have not, if Mr. P. who hath insulted us without Measure, can but bring himself to quit his *Arian Notions*, and to own this *Lord of Glory* as his Lord and God; and with the *Father* and *Spirit*, the supreme Object of his, and the Church's Worship; he'll easily have the same *Credit* and *Confidence* with us that he had before. Whatever Mr. P. may think and insinuate, 'tis our great Affliction, that we should lose the wonted Assistance of his and others Labours; and find their Abilities turn'd against these important Truths: which I hope were once as dear to them, as they now are to us.

If Mr. P. will make himself a *Party* with Dr. Clark, Mr. Whiston, the *Author* of a Letter to a Dissenter, &c. he must allow me to say, that he is at least an *Abettor* of *sophistical Arguments* and *Equivocations*. For I would fain know of Mr. P. whether 'tis possible to reconcile Dr. Clark's No-

tions with the *Articles*, and Liturgy of the Church of *England*, without a great deal of *Sophistry* and *Equivocation*? Whether without the same Helps, he can allow our *Saviour* to be God by *Nature*, truly and properly God; and yet deny at the same time, that he is one God with the *Father*; or that he hath what he says is the most essential Character of God: Mr. *P.* can't say but these are the Doctor's Notions; and I should be glad to know, how they can be defended without *Sophistry* and *Equivocation*. I confess, I never saw a Performance so stuff'd with them as the Doctor's is. Mr. *Whiston*, and the Letter to a Dissenter, are a little more frank and open: but yet strain a great many Texts of Scripture so notoriously, and withal so cunningly; that tho' I suppose they made a hard *Shift* to satisfy themselves; yet, 'tis likely they have deceiv'd some unwary Readers, and that not only among the *Laity*, but *Ministers* too. If Mr. *Whiston* doth not, as Mr. *P.* says, p. 51. distrust the Scriptures being on his side, it plainly looks as if he did; by his enlarging the *Bible*, and making that a part of the *Canon*, by which he thinks his Notions are better establish'd. But Mr. *P.* says, that whatever Mr. *Whiston* thinks, they adhere to the same Rule of Faith that their Brethren do. I hope he means more hereby, than one who lately explain'd himself before our *Assembly* thus, viz. That he believed all the Books of the old and new Testament to be divinely inspir'd; but yet not all things contain'd in these Books. For who can tell after this Rate, what large Exceptions may be made? And as to Dr. *Clark*, who also pretends to have the same Rule of Faith with others, he hath not only thrown 1 *John* v. 7. out of the *Bible*, but attempted to weaken the Authority of other Texts that are against his Notions: so that no one can tell with what *Limitations*, or according to what *Reading* he takes

takes the Scriptures for his *Rule*. He often speaks doubtfully in this Matter: and if Mr. P. who is his *Admirer*, would do the same; he may, in a Sense, take what he calls the Scriptures to be his *Rule*, and yet not have the same *Rule* that we have: I charge nothing on Mr. P. till I know how he is pleas'd to explain himself.

MR. P. I think, hath no reason to be so *Sanguine* as he seems, concerning the ancient *Copies* and *Versions*, as to 1 *John* v. 7. till what the learned Mr. *Martin* hath said upon the Subject, be better answer'd; and till *Beza's* Testimony be confuted: who says, he had seen the Text in some of *Stephens's* ancient *Books*, which undoubtedly must be *Greek Manuscripts*, because he takes Notice of the *Greek Articles*, and because there were at that time no ancient printed *Copies*. But says Mr. P. "If the Text was genuine, we see not that it serves at all to prove the point in Dispute." On the contrary, I think it proves it unanswerably: because the *Testimony* that these three are said to give, is said to be the *Witness* of the *Spirit*, v. 6. and the *Witness* of *God*, v. 9. i. e. that one living and true God, who is Truth and cannot lye. Now, how can the *Witness* of the *Father*, and the *Witness* of the *Son*, be the *Witness* of the *Spirit*, and the *Witness* of *God*, unless the *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit* have one Essence, and are one God? I have already consider'd Mr. P.'s Interpretation of *Rom.* ix. 5. and can't help thinking, that Dr. *Clark* and he must want an *Index Expurgatorius* for that, as also for *Mat.* xxviii. 19. for *John* i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10. for *Col.* i. 16, 17. *Col.* ii. 3, 9. *Phil.* ii. 5, 6. 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. *Jude* iv. 25. *Revel.* ii. 23. *Acts* i. 24. xx. 28. v. 3, 4. *Mat.* xii. 31, 32. *Rom.* ix. 1. *Acts* xv. 28. xviii. 25, 26, 27. compar'd with the sixth of *Isaiab* beginning. 1 *Cor.* ii. 11. 1 *Cor.* iii. 16. 1 *Cor.* xii. 4, 6, 11. compar'd. But to reckon up
all

all the Texts that Dr. *Clark*, &c. do put forc'd Interpretations upon, or pass over, as those that can't be criticiz'd away; would be to bring in a good part of his Book into this Answer. To see that we are not driven to such *Shifts*, with respect to the Texts Mr. *P.* refers to, p. 41. I desire that Dr. *Whitby* may be consulted on the three first; by which it will be clear, that the Sense that is put upon them is abundantly vindicated, and not after Dr. *Clark's Rate*. As for the last, he says nothing upon it; and indeed, I don't see there was any Reason why he should.

IF Mr. *P.* had well consider'd his own Expressions, and that he was writing against the *Assembly*, who had not meddled with *John xvii. 3. 1 Cor. viii. 6.* he would have chosen rather to own his own Inconsistency, than to bring a Charge of Unfairness against me. His Expression is, "I desire no better Evidence of Men's being guilty of these things, *i. e.* subtle Equivocations, and sophistical Arguments, than some Passages in this Paper, and the Accounts they use to give of such Texts." Would not every Body understand the Passage as I do, that we had us'd sophistical Arguments, as well as subtle Equivocations, in the Performance that Mr. *P.* was considering? There is nothing in the Words to direct us to such a distinct Application as is now mention'd: And I can hardly suppose, but Mr. *P.* himself intended that the Words should be taken as I took them: only he finds now, that if they are so taken, he can't be so consistent with himself. But tho' this be too much for Mr. *P.* to own, he might, considering his own Expressions, have forborn his Censures of me.

MR. *P.* I observe, can bring no Proof that the worst *Rancour* hath been utter'd in our *Prayers*, and therefore should not have us'd such harsh Language.

Language. The thing is so plain, that he is forc'd to own it, that we may pray against Error. Nor do I know, that ever it hath been thought a Fault in Christians, to pray that Christianity might prevail against *Heathenism, Judaism, Mahometanism, &c.* Nor yet that *pure and primitive Christianity*, might prevail against all those that have corrupted and debauch'd the Christian Religion, whether *Papists, Arians, &c.* This of Popish Idolatry and Superstition, I instanc'd in; to which Mr. P. says nothing: But says, "He takes it to be quite another thing to pray against Popish Persecution," which I did not mention. Now, tho' I utterly detest this, as I do their *Idolatry* and *Superstition*: yet, I can't see but the Reasons are every way as strong for praying against their *Idolatry*, as against their *Persecution*: They are both equally condemn'd by the Christian Religion. They are both equally opposite to its noble Design; which was, to root out of the World all *Creature*, and *Will-Worship*; as well as all *Rancour, Bitterness* and *Persecution*: And therefore, as we may innocently pray against the one, so I think we may against the other. And yet, I should be loth to say, that none in the *Church of Rome* are good, or have sincerely search'd for the Truth. I abhor their *Principles* and *Practices*, and think it my Duty to pray against them: and yet have *Charity* to suppose, *that they verily think with themselves*, as *Saul* in the like Case, *that they ought to do many things* against those that don't agree with them. Let Mr. P. then shew a Reason, why we may pray against *Persecution*, and not against *Idolatry*. Or why we may pray against *Heathenish*, or *Popish Idolatry*, and not against other kinds of *Idolatry*, whether *Arian, Socinian, &c.* Let him, I say, shew a substantial Reason for this; and 'twill effectually silence all future Objections of this sort. I am not sensible, but we have pray'd with

with all the *Modesty* and *Caution*, that became fallible Creatures. Nor do I know, that our Prayers, as Mr. P. suggests, p. 52. have given Dissatisfaction to any; but such as our Notions have given equal Dissatisfaction too.

To justify the Charge of *Reviling*, *Slandering*, setting up an *Inquisition*, and all the ways of *Injustice* and *Violence* that were in our Power, of palming gross *Falshoods* upon the World, &c. Mr. P. is pleas'd to reckon up, p. 52, 53. what we say against *Arianism*, and then to apply it to Himself and Brethren, as if it was said against them; and must therefore be what he says it is. I am very sorry to observe, that what we say of *Arianism*, doth so nearly affect Mr. P. as it doth: But I would fain know, whether we mayn't speak of *Arianism*, or any other Error as it doth deserve; without *Injustice* or *Violence*, without being *Slanders* or *Revilers*, and palming gross *Falshoods* upon the World? If we may not, then no Error must be spoken against. Then all, except Persons inspir'd, must be silent. Then *Protestants* have all along been to blame for speaking so freely against *Popery*; that they have charg'd those of the *Romish Communion* with *Idolatry* and *Superstition*: and even Mr. P. himself falls within the Charge as much as any, that he should call those *Antichristian Ages* that succeeded the third Century. I think, if *Arianism* doth destroy Christianity, &c. 'tis neither false, slanderous, violent, or unjust to say, that it doth: or even to say of Mr. P. himself, if he falls in with this *Scheme*, that his Opinions have such an unhappy Tendency.

WHEN we speak of any *Error*, we speak of it, and can't but speak of it according to our Apprehensions. And, if Mr. P. can't speak of *Socinianism* now, as he did formerly, as p. 54. it can't be, I apprehend, because no Errors may be thus spoken

spoken against; but because he hath now other Apprehensions of these *particular Notions* than he had before: which, tho' it may be a very good Reason with himself to be silent, yet it can't be so with other Persons; who have other Sentiments of their *Nature and Tendency* than Mr. P. hath. Mr. P. I am persuaded, can't say, but Persons may retain the Christian Name, and yet renounce the wholesome Principles of our common *Christianity*, &c. What doth he think of some *Notions* that are advanc'd in Mr. Toland's *Nazarenus*? And what would he say of those *Notions*, was he to write against them? Must he not say, that they enter into the very *Vitals* of Christianity; destroy *Christ's Satisfaction*; and tend to shake Men's Faith in the *Holy Scriptures*? Would it be unjust and violent; would he be a *Slanderer* and *Reviler* to speak thus? I can't say, but I have the same Opinion of *Arianism* and *Socinianism*. And when I read Mr. P.'s English Translation, where he says, I might have observ'd he had left it out, I did not think any more, than most or all that read it: That his Opinions, as to *Socinianism*, and some other things that he leaves out, were the same as before; and that there was some other Reason (whatever it might be) for that Omission. And this any one might be led to think, by what he himself says, p. 6. part 2^d. "All the several Chapters, (says he) which relate to Doctrinal Matters, relate only to Objections against some particular Divines; which, tho' I examin'd in the Answer design'd for Foreigners, I shall wholly wave in this Translation, design'd for the use of my own Countrymen. The *Dissenters* never objected against the *Articles*, or against *Subscribing* them, that they were *Arminian*; however they object, (and very justly) against those who subscrib'd them, being of a Judgment quite contrary to

N

" that

“ that declar’d in them : I should therefore pass
 “ directly to the last Chapter, were it not that the
 “ first hath somewhat, which hath, from the be-
 “ ginning of our *Controversy*, been in Debate ;
 “ and that of late, there may seem to be more
 “ than ordinary Reason why I should take Notice
 “ of it.” There is nothing in this Passage, from
 which it might be inferr’d, that Mr. P. had
 chang’d his Notions as to *Socinianism*, by omitting
 what he had said about it, any more than he had
 about *irresistible Grace*, the *Certainty of Salvation*,
universal Redemption, and *Predestination*, *Perseve-*
rance, *Justification*, *original Sin*. If a bare Omission
 of what is said about *Socinianism*, be a Reason to
 conclude, that his Sentiments are chang’d as to
Socinianism ; ’tis as strong a Reason to conclude,
 that they are chang’d also as to *Perseverance*, *Ju-*
stification, *Original Sin*, &c. And if this be really
 the Case, Mr. P.’s People are likely to have a *glo-*
rious Body of Divinity from him, if ever he thinks
 fit to speak out : But perhaps, for a certain Reason,
 what relates to the *Faith*, he’ll not touch upon. Let
 this be as it will, I could conclude no other from
 his *English Translation*, but that his Notions, as to
 the doctrinal Points omitted, were still the same.
 Yea, no one could think, by what Mr. P. says,
 but he could subscribe the *Articles* again, that we
 are oblig’d to subscribe : But ’tis very evident now
 that he could not, because his Notions of *Religion*
 were then chang’d, and those of *Liberty* were be-
 fore enlarg’d : and therefore, to insinuate thus much,
 does not carry that fair *Appearance* in it, that the
 Management of every *Divine* should ; who should
 always, I think, look upon it as a *Blemish* upon his
 Character, to delude and impose upon Mankind.

MR. P. hath thought fit at last, to own, why
 what he had said of *Socinianism* is omitted ; to tell
 the World, that he is sorry that he hath said it,
 and

and to condemn his own Expressions. I should therefore now be glad to know, what more *per-nicious Heresy* did ever spring up in the Church, than *Socinianism* is? 'Tis not hard, I think, to say of this Error and its *Abettors*, what the *Apostle* saith of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, whose Error was, that the *Resurrection was already past: that their Words did eat, as doth a Canker; that they had over-thrown the Faith of some; and that their Error was a fundamental one, 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, 19.* For, is this more contrary to Scripture, or hath it a worse Influence upon the *Virtues* of the Christian Life, than 'tis to say, that our blessed Saviour is a *meer Man*; That the World was not made by him; that he did not dye as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the World; that he ought not to be worship'd because a meer Creature, (which was the Opinion of some,) or that he ought, tho' he was a meer Creature, (which was the Opinion of others, &c?) If this be not to tear up the *Foundations* of *Christianity*, I don't know what is. I can't find, but the *Mahometans* have as honourable Thoughts of our blessed Saviour, as the *Soci-nians* have. And how can this but influence the *Virtues* of the Christian Life? Can our Reverence and Love rise higher than the Objects on which they terminate? Can the same be due to a Creature that is due to God? Does it lay no Engagement upon us to act well, that God was manifest in Flesh? If to be in the *Form of God*, doth signify, as I think it doth, that our Saviour was really God, God most high; it must influence more, not only to *Humility*, but other *Virtues*, that he should take upon him the *Form of a Servant*, and be made in the *Likeness of Man*, than if he was only a *meer Creature*. The Condescension in one Case, must be infinitely greater than it can be in the other; and must accordingly carry much greater

Weight and Influence with it. 'Tis urg'd accordingly upon *Ministers*, to take heed unto themselves, and to all the *Flock*; and to employ their Gifts for the good of the *Church*, over which the *Holy Ghost* hath made them *Overseers*; and hath, as God, furnish'd them with suitable Gifts for that Purpose: And that God hath purchas'd the *Church* with his own Blood, *Acts* xx. 28. *1 Cor.* xii. 6, 7. 'Tis urg'd also upon *Christians*, that they should be pure, and glorify God with their *Bodies and Spirits*, that they are the *Temples of the Holy Ghost*, the *Temples of the living God*; and that they have been redeem'd with the precious Blood of the Son of God; a Lamb without Blemish, and without Spot, *1 Cor.* iii. 16, 17. *2 Cor.* vi. 16. *1 Cor.* vi. 20. *1 Pet.* i. 19. If these Passages should be interpreted according to the *Arian*, or *Socinian* Hypothesis, the Influence of them would be very feeble; whereas, if they are taken in the *Catholick Sense*, there can no Considerations be more powerful. So that it can't be true what Mr. P. hath advanc'd, p. 54. that our Notions, whether true or false, have no Influence upon the *Virtues* of the *Christian Life*: For it must greatly strengthen the Obligations of *Christianity*, if they are true; and proportionably weaken them if they are false. If our Redeemer be God, there must necessarily a much higher *Love, Respect, Gratitude, Obedience* be due to him, than if he be not. And besides, 'tis evident to me, from what follows in the next ten Pages of Mr. P.'s Answer, that he, in Consequence of his Notions, denies all proper divine Worship of our blessed Saviour; and will allow none, proper or improper, to be due to the *Holy Ghost*: which shews, that the Notions disputed between us, affect with a *Witness*, the *Christian Life*: Unless it be said, as I suppose it won't, that to fix upon a right Object of Worship, to pay it where due, and when requir'd, is not a Matter of great Importance and

and *Concernment* in the Christian Life : This also is greatly affected in other Instances, as well as this.

THERE is no one, I believe, that reads attentively what Mr. P. hath said about Worship, p. 54. &c. but must allow, (if he speaks the Sense of others as well as his own; their former as well as their present Sense,) that there was too much Reason to say, that the *Object of Worship* was chang'd. Mr. P. may, according to his peculiar way of speaking, call this, if he pleaseth, a gross Falshood : But I am very much mistaken, if what he hath said, doth not prove it to be the *clearest Truth* : For the very utmost that I can make, of the Worship that he allows to be due to our blessed Saviour, amounts to no more, that what he thinks may be paid to a created Being, if there was a divine Appointment; which he all along, I apprehend, supposeth there might have been. According to Mr. P. we are never to worship our Saviour, as the living and true God; but only as the Father's *Representative* : And if I take him right, he won't allow, that the *Holy Ghost* is to be worship'd at all. I can't find, that he looks upon our being baptiz'd in his Name, as any part of Christian Worship. And farther, when I say, that it may be prov'd that Worship is due to the *Holy Ghost* : if this be true, says he, p. 61. " let him produce one Passage of Scripture, that is a clear Evidence, that ever the *Holy Ghost* " was directly address'd in Prayer or Praise." p. 61. If this be true that Mr. P. offers, that an inferior Being, or a meer Creature, might have been worship'd just as our Saviour is, if there had been such an Appointment; And that the *Holy Ghost* is not to be worship'd at all: I think, all must see, that we differ as to the *Object of Worship*. We differ as much, or rather more, as to this, than we and the *Papists*. Yea, according to Mr. P. p. 61. the great Difference between us and the
Heathens,

Heathens, is, that we have a Command for what we do, and they none. According to the Drift of Mr. P.'s Argument, the *Lycaonians*, who would have done *Sacrifice* to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts*. xiv. were culpable for no other Reason, but that they had not a divine *Warrant* for what they did. According to him, I don't see, but the *Apostles* might have been own'd for God's *Representatives*; and had a *Grant* given them for the same religious Worship that our Saviour hath. But if we look into the Passage, we may easily be convinc'd, that this was not the way that the *Apostles* took to restrain them from doing *Sacrifice*. They don't tell them, that God had not thought fit to allow them this high Honour; but plainly suggest, that he could not, in Consistency with his own Honour. They were so mov'd at the Dishonour that was doing to God, that they rent their Cloaths, and ran in among the People, crying out, and saying, *Sirs*, why do ye these things? we also are Men of like Passions with you; and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these Vanities, to the living God; which made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and all things that are therein: who in times past, suffer'd all Nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without Witness, in that he did good, and gave them Rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seasons, filling their Hearts with Food and Gladness: And with these Sayings, scarce restrain'd they the People, that they had not done *Sacrifice* unto them.

By what the *Apostles* say in this Passage, 'tis evident, that they were very jealous of the Honour of God, and taught the People of *Lycaonia*, not as Mr. P. 'tis likely, and our modern Gentlemen would have taught them, that all religious Worship, ought ultimately to be referr'd to God: But that a relative, and subordinate Worship, indeed, might be paid to Creatures, if there was a Command;

mand, as there was not in the present Case. No, they teach them, that Worship was God's *Peculiar*; that he, and he alone, that was the *Maker* and *Governour* of Heaven and Earth, was the *sole Object* of Worship. That to offer Sacrifice to any but him, under any Consideration, was *flat Idolatry*, a Wrong to God, and an Injury to themselves. The *Apostle* doth not argue with them, upon the sole Authority of that *Jewish Law*, *Exod. xxii. 20.* *That he that sacrificeth unto any God, save unto the Lord only, he shall utterly be destroy'd:* Nor doth he argue with them upon the Principles of Christian Revelation, that all Sacrifices were now to cease: but as taking it for granted, that Sacrifices were still to be offer'd, he tells them, upon the *Principles* of *Reason*, and *natural Religion*, that they may not be offer'd to any, but the *Maker* of Heaven and Earth. He doth not absurdly distinguish, between *absolute* and *relative*; between *supreme* and *inferior Sacrifices*: but roundly tells them, that none, besides the Creator of Heaven and Earth, ought in any Sense, or upon any Consideration, to be sacrific'd unto.

THE Case, I think, is full as clear, as to those Branches of religious Worship, which Mr. P. according to his *Way*, allows we may pay to our blessed Saviour. The Case of *Baptism*, I have already consider'd, and as to calling on our Saviour, trusting in him, and ascribing Glory to him; these are as much appropriated to the most high God, as Sacrifice is. And whereas Mr. P. says, p. 64. that he hath made it plain, that the Scripture is on their side: Where doth the Scripture speak of absolute and relative, of supreme and inferior, of *ultimate Prayers*, and those that are not *ultimate*? He can't produce, I believe, any Precept or Example, or so much as an Intimation, that such Prayers are innocent, or ever were made. He must not think to

put

put me off with such Prayers, as are offer'd directly, and immediately to our blessed Saviour: for this is the thing in *Dispute* between us: And this I bring as a Proof, that our Saviour is the great and supreme God; Because, according to the *old Testament*, and the *new*, we are to offer our Prayers to none but him. The Law to worship God, and none but God, is still in force and unrepeal'd: and this is so clear to every one that reads the *Bible*, that Mr. P. himself is forc'd to grant it; tho' at the Expence of contradicting himself, when he owns, that we are to call on the Son. My Argument is, that if we are to address our Prayers to our Saviour; or to call upon him for the highest, and best Blessings that we need, as *Grace, Mercy and Peace*, &c. he is God: and that if he be not God, we are not to address our Prayers unto him. Nor is it sufficient to say, that he is God in a *subordinate Sense*: For when all the *subtle* things are said, that can be said, what is *less* than God is not God: What is less than God, is *infinitely less*: What is less than God, is a God only in *Name*, but a Creature in *Truth*; and can never be the Object of our Adoration, till the first Commandment, and that of our Saviour, *Matt. iv. 10.* be repealed. And if this Reason be just, then Mr. P.'s Question, *p. 64.* "Could there be any need to make such a Stir and Contention as we have seen?" is answer'd thus, That nothing could be more needful, than to endeavour to keep that *Idolatry* out of the Church, that some were *clandestinely*, and others more *openly* bringing in. This is sufficient to justify the Zeal of the *Assembly*, with all that have a due Regard to the *Purity and Importance* of Christian Worship. And if the *Peace* of the Church is any way interrupted, those are answerable for it, that were the *Aggressors*; that would strip our Saviour and Sanctifier of their due Honour, and would establish the
Worship

Worship of the Christian Church, upon a *Paganish, Popish, Anti-scriptural Foundation.*

BUT to consider farther, what Mr. P. says upon the Head of *Worship*: And here I can't but observe, that he talks like one pinch'd and confounded; sometimes granting that we may worship our Saviour, and sometimes seeming to deny it: For when I say, that the great Object of Worship propos'd to us in Scripture, is the *supreme God*. To this says Mr. P. "I readily agree: and say farther, "that this God is but one, and is the Father." When I say, that the *Jews* are expressly requir'd, to worship no other than the God of *Israel*; who was the living, and true, and supreme God: Mr. P. grants it, and says, "That this was no other "than the Father." When I offer from Bishop *Burnet*, that 'tis not said, that they should not worship any as God, till they had a *Precept* or *Declaration* for it: that there is no *Reserve* for any such time: But they are plainly forbid to worship any but the great God; because he was one, and jealous of his Glory. This, says Mr. P. "I readily allow "too. And that all that Worship that is not "properly the Worship of this one great God, is "here forbidden." And yet, tho' Mr. P. by these, and many Expressions to the same Purpose, doth seem to confine all Worship and Adoration to the Father; yet he allows, that we are to call upon Christ, to ascribe Glory to him, &c. And when I produce many Instances of Worship that were paid to Christ, "I allow it, says he, p. 61. in all "Instances, wherein, by worshipping him, we "worship ultimately the Father." Now, according to this way of talking, we may be oblig'd to worship God only; and yet, at the same time, be requir'd to worship *Saints* and *Angels*, yea *Stocks* and *Stones*, *four-footed Beasts*, and *creeping things*: We may be requir'd to apply to God alone, for
O Grace,

Grace, Mercy, Pardon, Peace, and other Blessings; and yet be oblig'd, if God had seen fit, to apply to the *Virgin Mary*, or some other Saint, in the same Words, and at the same time, and for the same Blessings; provided, we had an *ultimate, sovereign Respect* to God in these Applications. This is the way that Mr. P. takes, to reconcile the suppos'd Practice of the *Jews*, in worshipping the Cloud, and the Angel of the Covenant, who, he thinks, was not the true God: And also, our worshipping of Christ, the same Angel of the Covenant, inhabiting the humane Nature now; as he did the Cloud of old, with the Precept of worshipping God only. He takes the Case relating to the *Jews* for granted, and says, "That the Reason in our Case for worshipping Christ, is the same. For, says he, p 57. "The worshipping the Person who truly represents him, is indeed, "a worshipping the only true God, who is represented by him.

It shews a Man's good Inclination to an Opinion, when, rather than drop it, he'll swallow such *Absurdities*; talk after this *Paganish*, and *Popish Manner*, in defence of it. 'Tis true, the *Pagans* had no Command for what they did: But then 'tis considerable, that they had nothing but the *Light* and *Dictates* of Nature, to direct them in any thing that they did: and by Mr. P. it looks, as if it was not contrary to these; because, he supposeth, that such *Worship* as this may be commanded, and so cease to become sinful: which, I think, if contrary to the Light of Nature, it could not. And seeing, according to him, God hath commanded something like it; the first Christians, and we, in the Arguments we bring against the Heathens, on the Account of their idolatrous Worship, must have been much mistaken; in saying, that they acted contrary to all Reason, and the Light of Nature.

We

We should, it seems, have grounded our Reasonings against them on this, (which the Scriptures are never so impertinent, and wide of the Purpose to do) that they had no Command for what they did. But the *Apostles* and *Prophets* before them, were weak enough to argue as we do; that such Worship is ridiculous and absurd; dishonourable to God, and directly contrary to the Light of Nature. Their Argument, according to the general Tenour of Scripture, was, that we ought to worship no Creature, ultimately or otherwise, none besides the *Creator* of Heaven and Earth. This, I take not only to be the Sense, but is, according to the best *Criticks*, the proper rendring of *Rom. i. 25.*

NOR ought it to seem strange at all to Mr. P. as he speaks, p. 59. that after so many learned Men, I render it thus: For, tho' he would fain make me so ridiculous as to say, that I believ'd every Word in our *English Translation*, was by divine *Inspiration*; yet, I very much question, whether he writes as he thinks, or does himself believe, (tho' he would have others to believe it) the Information that he had about this Matter. I can't tell how to suppose, that he thinks I was so weak and silly as to offer this. Surely, if I han't the Knowledge and Learning that some have; yet, I can't be ignorant, that the *English Translation* hath been more than once corrected; and that it wants Correction still. And I remember it well, that at the very time when we were speaking about the *English Translation*, I asserted, that it wanted to be corrected, and instanc'd particularly in *2 Cor. viii. 1.* Could I then be so ignorant, or blasphemous as to say this, if I thought every Word inspir'd by the *Holy Ghost*? No, my Thoughts of the *Holy Ghost*, (whatever some other Persons may be) are too high and adoring to think or speak after such a Rate. If Mr. P. would expose me, he should offer something

thing that looks probable: But to offer what he here does, tho' it shews a good Inclination to render me contemptible; yet, I'll presume to believe, it won't serve his Purpose; but return with *Disgrace*, either upon *himself* or his *cautious Informers*. What I think of the *English Translation* now, is what I thought then, *viz.* that it was a very useful Work, and tolerably well done. And what I, with most others, think of this place is, that the *Apostle* doth here condemn all *Creature Worship*, as contrary to the Light of Nature: and therefore, such as can't be enjoin'd by him, who is the God of Nature; and ever was, and can't but be jealous of his own Honour.

THIS Mr. P. seems to own, p. 59. when I urge that Text, *Gal. iv. 8.* that we are *not to do Service to them that by Nature are no Gods*. "For that Reason, says he, we do Service to him that is by Nature God: but we choose to do him Service, in the way he hath appointed." What doth Mr. P. mean? Will he venture to deny, that *proper Worship* is due to our blessed Saviour? The Question is, whether we may address our selves to the Father, and our Saviour, in the same Words, and for the same Blessings, if they are not the same God? Whether we may apply to our Saviour, as we do to the Father, for *Grace, Mercy and Peace*: or, (to use Mr. P.'s own Expressions since he came to *Exon*, and had chang'd his Notions) whether we may, without *Idolatry*, unless our Saviour be God by *Nature*, God in the highest Sense, apply to him as Mr. P. taught his People? *viz.* "O my blessed Redeemer, I am not able to expel these Clouds of Ignorance and Darknes, that cover my Understanding: I am not able to manage my self, and order my Steps aright, and oppose the Enemies of my Salvation: Therefore, my Expectations are on thee. Thou shalt instruct me

“ me the way I shall go: thou shalt lead and up-
 “ hold me. Do thou but command, and I will obey:
 “ It is thy Will, that shall henceforward be to me a
 “ standing Law: and under thy Banners will I ma-
 “ nage my spiritual Warfare: and in thy strength will
 “ I conflict all my spiritual Enemies. 'Tis thou shalt
 “ lead me through all Dangers and Difficulties;
 “ my *Help* and *Refuge* whilst I live, and *Hope* and
 “ *Support* when I die: and then shalt thou tran-
 “ slate me to those Mansions that are in thy Fa-
 “ ther's House. These are the things I want; and
 “ come to thee for them: for I am resolv'd, my
 “ Trust shall be in thee, the *Lord Jehovah*, and
 “ thee only.” I would fain know, whether such
 an Address, as he himself calls it, can be offer'd to
 any but the supreme God, without *Idolatry*? Such
 an Address, upon the receiv'd Principle of our Sa-
 viour's being God most High, is not only warren-
 table, but a Duty justifiable by *Scripture Direction*,
 and *Apostolical* and *Primitive Practice*: and most
 consonant to the *fundamental, unalterable Rule* of
 all Worship. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,*
and him only shalt thou serve. But to justify it, up-
 on his Principle of our Saviour's being an inferior,
 subordinate, dependant God; is, I think, impossi-
 ble: Nor do I see, (by the way) that Mr. P. could
 teach his People thus to worship the Redeemer up-
 on his present Principles (which, it seems, are the
 same that he brought with him to *Exon*) without
 teaching them to be *Idolaters*.

MR. P. seems to think, that 'tis sufficient to
 justify our Worship of Christ, though we take
 him to be such an inferiour dependent Being,
 “ that the *Jews*, in Consistency with their wor-
 “ shiping the only true God, did worship the
 “ *Cloud* upon the account of the Inhabitation of
 “ the Angel of the Covenant.” Which was, as he
 says, not the true God himself, but only his *Re-*
presentative,

presentative, p. 56, 57. But here I think are two considerable Mistakes, (1.) That the *Jews* worship'd the Cloud, and (2.) That he who inhabited the Cloud was not the true God.

I FIND nothing in Scripture, that the *Jews* were oblig'd to worship the Cloud, or that they actually did it. I don't deny, but they might pay some such Respect thereto, as they afterwards did unto the *Temple*; or such, as some do still pay to Places set a-part for Religious Worship: and this, I suppose, is all that Bishop *Burnet* means, in the Expressions quoted by Mr. P. because when speaking before of *proper Worship*, he says, p. 48. "that even the *Humane Nature* of Christ can't be worship'd: and that therefore there must be another Nature in him, to which *Divine Worship* is due; and on the account of which he is to be worshipp'd." I can't think, that he would allow more to the Cloud than to the *Humane Nature* of Christ: But if he does, I differ as much from him as I do from Mr. P. and must think it ridiculous and absurd, as well as idolatrous; to offer up Prayers or Praises to the Cloud. God gave no Direction to the *Jews* to do this; nor do I find, that ever it was their *Practice*: Nor can I see, how it could be consistent with their own Laws about Worship if it had. And farther, I say, that by the same Laws, it would have been idolatrous, to worship him who dwelt in the Cloud of Glory as the *Jews* did, unless he had been the most *High God*. To make which evident, I'll take it for granted, with Mr. P. and indeed with many of the *Primitive Writers*, (tho' not excluding the Father as Mr. P. doth) that it was our Saviour, the Divine *λογος*, that appear'd to the *Patriarchs*, and dwelt in the Cloud. Now if we consider these *Forms of Worship*, and what else occurs in Scripture; 'twill not only shew, what

what Apprehensions the *Jews* had of that *glorious Person* that appear'd to their Fathers, and inhabited the Cloud; but put it beyond all Dispute, that he is God most High. I shall first consider, what is said of him that appear'd, and dwelt in the Cloud; and then account for those Texts that Mr. P. brings to prove, that he could not be the only true God that did personally appear, or dwell in the Cloud, or speak to *Moses*, and the Children of *Israel*.

To shew how little there is to support such a strange Assertion, let it be consider'd, how that Glorious Person is spoken of, and worship'd, that appear'd to our *first Parents*; and afterwards to *Abraham*, to *Jacob*, to *Moses*, and dwelt in the Cloud of Glory: and if Words can make it plain, it must, I think, be evident, that he was the living and true God, and was reverenc'd and worship'd as such. In the third of *Genesis*, where we have the first account of God's appearing among Men, he is there spoken of, as the same Lord God, that in the two first Chapters is represented, as the great Creator of all Things. He is not only call'd God *twelve* or *thirteen* times in this one Chapter; but spoken of as that God, whose *Sovereignty Adam* and his *Wife* had insulted; and whose Law they had broken: As one who was the Lord of *Life* and *Death*. There is not the least Notice taken, that he was the *Representative* of the true God; or that he had any God above him: but in the very next Chapter is mention'd, as the God to whom *Cain* and *Abel* offer'd Sacrifice. There is no question to be made, at least concerning *Abel's* Sacrifice, but it was offer'd to the living and true God; the great Lord and Sovereign of the World; the great Lover and Rewarder of Righteous Persons, *Heb. xi. 4. 6.* and who was this God, but that same Lord, that testify'd his *Acceptance* of *Abel's* Sacrifice, and his *Abhorrence* of *Cain's*?

THERE

THERE seems to be no Reason to doubt; but it was the same living and true God that appeared to *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii.* To satisfy *Abraham*, that he was able to fulfil whatever he should promise, he tells him, that he was the *Almighty God* to whom all Homage and Obedience was due: *I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be perfect: And I will make my Covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.* Throughout the Chapter, we may observe he speaks with all the *Majesty* and *Authority* of the Great God: He speaks of the Covenant of which Circumcision was the Seal as his Covenant: And 'tis evident, that *Abraham* thought him to be so; and therefore, did not only prostrate himself before him in Token of his Reverence; but makes Supplication to him, *v. 18.* on behalf of *Ishmael*. If this God was our Saviour, as Mr. P. supposeth; would he not at least have intimated to *Abraham*, that he was not really the true God; but only his *Deputy* and *Representative*? Would he have accepted that *Divine Homage*, that *Abraham* pays him here, and in other Places; without letting him once know, that if he took him to be the Great and ever *Glorious Jehovah*, he was mistaken? That he ought not to regard him as any other than God's *Representative*; nor to pay him any other *Homage*, but what was *Relative* and *Inferior*: But as to this, the Scripture is altogether silent. The God that appear'd to him, doth always speak of himself, as the Great God; and accepts of *Prayers* and *Sacrifices* from him as the God of the Universe; and one to whom they were justly due. 'Tis directly contrary to the Light of Nature, to worship any but the True God: To offer Sacrifice to any but him, is neither the Voice of *Reason* nor *Revelation*. And how can we entertain such a Thought of our Saviour, that he would without
Objection,

Objection, receive the Homage peculiar to the Eternal God, the great Creator of Heaven and Earth; if his *Nature* and *Perfections*, his *Rights*, and *Regalities* were not the same? If they are the same, this is easily accounted for: but how it can upon other Principles, I don't understand.

THIS will be farther evident still, if we consider how God appear'd to *Moses* in the burning *Bush*; and afterwards to him and the *Israelites* in the *Cloud*, and was worship'd by them. Our Blessed Saviour himself, and his *Proto-Martyr* St. *Stephen*, have both put it beyond all Doubt, that that glorious Person who appear'd in the *Bush*, and spake to *Moses*, was no other than the living and true God. *As touching the Dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the Book of Moses, how in the Bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, or as 'tis in St. Matthew, God is not the God of the dead but of the living, Matth. xxii. 31, 32. Mark xii. 26, 27. Acts vii. 32.* As our Saviour doth not here exclude himself; so 'tis clear, that 'twas God himself, & *Deus*, that God, who is the living and true God, the *Lover*, the *Rewarder*, and *Portion* of Righteous Persons: that God, who as the *Sovereign Possessor* of all Blessings, had enter'd into Covenant with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, that he would make them compleatly, and for ever happy. 'Twas this God that spake to *Moses*. And to satisfy *Moses*, that he was this God, and no other, and one that might be depended upon, to carry him through all the Difficulties of his Undertaking, he tells him, upon his Inquiry by what Name he should call him: that his Name was, *I AM THAT I AM: and that he should say unto the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.* Moreover it follows, *God said unto*
P *Moses,*

Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, the LORD God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my Name for ever, and this my Memorial unto all Generations, *Exod. iii. 6, 13, 14, 15.* 'Tis hardly possible, that words should make it plainer, that this was the living and true God. And this God, who did appear to *Moses*, and did conduct both him, and the *Israelites* in all their Affairs; was acknowledg'd, both by *Moses* and them, as the ever Glorious God, and worship'd accordingly. They were to solicit *Pharaoh*, that they might go into the Wilderness, to offer Sacrifice to this God, *Exod. iii. 18.* 'Twas in Honour of this God, and in Obedience to his Commands, that they kept the Pass-over. And if we consider, how this God was own'd and worship'd, by *Moses* and the *Israelites*, by his own immediate Direction, and under his own Inspiration, after the Overthrow of the *Egyptians*; there can be no farther Room to question, whether it was the Living and True God that appear'd to *Moses* and the *Israelites*, and was worship'd by them.

I AM surpriz'd, that any one should imagine, that it was the Son of God, the Divine *λογος*, that appear'd to *Moses*; and yet at the same time assert, that he is not the living and true God. How can it ever be imagin'd, that such a Prophet as *Moses*, should address a *Nominal*, *Deputy*, *Representative* God; as he doth that God, who had saved them out of the Hands of the *Egyptians*? Yea, how can any be address'd but the true God in such a Strain, and with such Solemnity, without the most *Infamous Idolatry*? Let me only transcribe a few Passages out of *Moses's* Song, *Exod. xv.* and refer to the rest. Then sang *Moses*, and the Children of Israel this Song unto the LORD,
I
and

and spake, saying, *I will sing unto the LORD, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the Horse and the Rider hath he cast into the Sea. The LORD is my Strength and Song, and he is become my Salvation: He is my God, and I will prepare him an Habitation; my Father's God, and I will exalt him. Thy right Hand, O LORD, is become glorious in Power: thy right Hand, O LORD, hath dashed in Pieces the Enemy. Who is like unto thee, O LORD, among the Gods? Who is like thee, glorious in Holiness, fearful in Praises, doing Wonders? the LORD shall reign for ever and ever, &c.* I don't see, how there can be any such thing as Idolatry, if a Nominal God, a God by Office may be thus address'd: Nor can I possibly conceive how God should give the Glory so peculiar to himself, as he here doth, to his Representative. And yet after all, it can't be doubted, but this was given to that God who appear'd to *Moses*; and is said by the Apostle to be our Saviour; whom the Jews tempted; not in Opposition to, or Exclusion of the Father, and Holy Ghost, but in Conjunction with them. 'Tis clear methinks, beyond all Controversy, that *Moses*, who was divinely inspir'd, did not think this God to be God's Deputy, and Representative; but the most High God himself: And accordingly, when a little before his Death, he came to rehearse the marvellous Things that God had done for the *Israelites*, and to bless the twelve Tribes; he always speaks of him as the most High God, *Deut. xxxiii.* and for *Joseph* particularly, he prays, amongst other things, *that the Blessing and good Will of him who dwelt in the Bush might be his Portion, Deut. xxxiii. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.* 'Tis abundantly clear from all this, that he who appear'd to the *Israelites* was the true God.

BUT, though I have drawn out this Argument to a great length already; yet seeing, I am arguing with Mr. P. upon his own *Concession*, and this is an Argument that was much insisted upon in the very *Beginning* of Christianity, to prove that our Saviour was God; I shall crave leave to add, what is said of him who dwelt in the *Cloud of Glory*, and what *Worship* it was that the *Jews* paid him; by which I hope it will be farther evident, that he was the *Supreme God*, and one God with the Father. In *Exod. xvi. 10.* it is said, that *the Glory of the Lord appear'd in the Cloud*; that *LORD*, whose Praises *Moses* had sang a little before; that *LORD*, against whom the *Israelites* murmured, though he had done such amazing things for them. 'Twas this Glorious *LORD* that said to *Moses*, v. 12. *I have heard the Murmurings of the Children of Israel; speak unto them, saying, at Even ye shall eat Flesh, and in the Morning ye shall be fill'd with Bread: and ye shall know that I am the LORD your God.* Not his *Deputy* and *Representative*: No; it was *Jehovah himself*, against whom they murmured. *Your Murmurings*, says *Moses*, v. 8. *are not against us but against the LORD*; that very *LORD* whom *Jethro*, Ch. xviii. 10, 11, 12. did solemnly bless, and with the *Israelites* offer'd Sacrifice to; and of whom he says, that he was greater than all Gods. 'Twas no other than that God who appear'd in the Cloud, that *Jethro* and the *Israelites* sacrific'd to, and of whom *Jethro* thus speaks: And therefore what is said of him, could not be true, if only God's *Deputy* and *Representative*: and to offer Sacrifice to him, if no more, would have been *Idolatry*. 'Twas this same God, that afterwards appear'd in the Mount, and deliver'd the *Ten Commandments* in his own Name. Told the Children of *Israel*, and in them the rest of Mankind, *that*
they

they should have no other Gods but him, *Exod. xx. 3. and, that such as sacrific'd to any God, save un- to the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroy'd, Exod. xxii. 20.* And this same LORD, who had thus caution'd the Jews against Idolatry, was he, that presently after, both Moses and the Jews did offer Sacrifice to, *Exod. xxiv.*

'T WAS this same LORD, that gave Direction to Moses, to make a *Mercy Seat*, and *Two Cherubims*, and told him, that he would meet with him, and commune with him, from above the *Mercy Seat*, from between the two *Cherubims*, which are upon the *Ark of the Testimony*, of all things which he should give him in Commandment to the Children of Israel, *Exod. xxv. 17, 18, 22.* And if we do but consider, what is farther said of this God, who dwelt between the *Cherubims*, in the *Cloud of Glory*; and how he was worship'd, even in *Asaph's*, and *Hezekiah's* Time; 'twill make it evident to a Demonstration, that as it was (by Mr. P.'s Concession) our Saviour that appear'd, and dwelt between the *Cherubims*, in the *Cloud of Glory*; so he was worship'd, as the *Supreme God*, with the highest Worship, even long before his Incarnation. Whether he was worship'd before with distinct Worship, as he is now under the Gospel (which some think) is not, I apprehend, so material. 'Tis sufficient, that he, who dwelt between the *Cherubims* was worship'd, and in a manner that shews it to be proper, divine, and therefore, (according to the Distinction that some have coin'd) *supreme Worship*. How very full to this Purpose are the Words of *Asaph*, and *Hezekiah*? Of *Asaph*, *Psal. lxxx.* throughout. Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, (the very Title of our Saviour, *Zachar. xiii. 7.* compar'd with *Matth. xxvi. 31.*) thou that leadeest Joseph like a Flock, thou that dwellest between the
Cherubims,

Gherubims, shine forth. Before Ephraim, and Benjamin, and Manasseh, stir up thy Strength, and come and save us. Turn us again, O God; cause thy Face to shine, and we shall be saved. O Lord God of Hosts, how long wilt thou be angry against the Prayer of thy People &c? The glorious Object here worship'd, is called either God, or God of Hosts, or Lord God of Hosts, no less than five times in this short Psalm. The People of *Israel* are spoken of as his People: and those that had their entire Dependence upon his Protection. And how must it sink our value for the Sacred Scriptures, if an inspir'd Author shall thus address himself, and that as it were in the Name of the whole Church, to a *Deputy God*; and teach others to do the same thing? If our Saviour be the true God, the Language is proper, and the Worship regular: If he be not, the Worship here paid is idolatrous. And so also, I take that of *Hezekiah* to be, *Isa. xxxvii. 15, 16. &c.* And *Hezekiah* prayed unto the LORD, saying, O LORD of Hosts, God of *Israel*, that dwellest between the *Gherubims*, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth, thou hast made Heaven and Earth. Incline thine Ear, O LORD, and hear; Open thine Eyes, O LORD, and see: and hear all the Words of *Sennacharib*, which hath sent to reproach the Living God. Of a truth, LORD, the Kings of *Assyria* have laid waste all the Nations, and their Countries, and have cast their Gods into the Fire: for they were no Gods, but the Works of Mens Hands, Wood and Stone: therefore they have destroy'd them. Now therefore, O LORD our God, save us from his Hand, that all the Kingdoms of the Earth may know, that thou art the LORD, even thou only. 'Twas not to God's Representative, but the God of *Israel* himself, the great Creator of Heaven and Earth, the living God, that *Hezekiah* thus

thus pray'd, as *Isaiah* says : that God, that *Moses* had before worship'd, and represented as descending in the Cloud, dwelling between the Cherubims, and proclaiming himself the LORD, the LORD God, Merciful and Gracious, Long-suffering, and abundant in Goodness and Truth, keeping Mercy for thousands, forgiving Iniquity Transgression and Sin, that will by no means clear the Guilty; visiting the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children, and upon the Childrens Children, to the third and fourth Generation. And that had given it in Charge to the *Israelites*, that they should destroy the Altars of all Idolaters, and worship no other God but himself : because he whose Name was Jealous, was a jealous God, *Exod.* xxxiv. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14.

I MUST think, 'tis clear by what I have offer'd, that it was the true God, that appear'd to the *Patriarchs*, to *Moses*, and to the *Israelites*, and was worship'd by them; and that their Worship can't be excus'd from *Idolatry* if it was not. By this also it appears, that 'tis not by the Father's Courtesy, or Gift, that our Saviour is worship'd : but that in *Conjunction* with the Father, he hath a Right to Worship, as the great Creator and Sovereign of the World. The Forms of Worship that I have produc'd do demonstrate this. To which let me add, that if our Saviour, as sole Judge of universal Mankind, &c. hath any peculiar Worship, by the Gift, or rather the Consent of the Father; it must be upon this Foundation still, that he is God : and that the World might be brought to own by this means, that he was God : It being impossible, according to our Apprehensions, that God should authorize the Worship of any Person how exalted soever, that is not God by Nature. 'Tis not, I think, more impossible for God to lye, than 'tis to appoint that any

any *Representative* of his, or any inferior to and dependent on himself, should be worship'd as that glorious Person was, that appear'd to the *Jews*. 'Tis undeniable, that the *Jews* worship'd him as the *Supreme God* : Nor are they ever blam'd that they did so. They look'd no higher, or farther, and mention'd it in their very Prayers, that there was no God besides : They look'd upon him that appear'd, to be the *Author* of their Beings, and the *Fountain* of their Blessings, and accordingly worship'd him as such. And this could be no *Idolatry*, if we allow our Saviour, as we must, to be one that made all Things, and made them all for himself, as the Scriptures declare, and so to be one God with the Father, according to the *receiv'd Notion* : But it must be the most infamous, abominable *Idolatry* in the *Jews*, and perfectly inconsistent with their own Religion, to transfer, as they did, the Homage so peculiar to the most high God to any *Representative* of his, how glorious soever.

AND thus having destroy'd the *Foundation*, on which Mr. P. builds what he says about the Worship of him that appear'd to the *Jews*, and dwelt in the Cloud : I am now, according to my Promise, to account for those Texts, by which Mr. P. endeavours to prove, that he could not be the only true God. And here, should I only say, that these Texts brought by Mr. P. as *John* v. 37. *John* i. 18, 14. 1 *John* i. 1, 2, 3. 1 *Tim.* 6. 16. do only relate to the *Father*, who, is neither in these, nor any other Texts of Scripture, spoken of as the only true God, in *Exclusion* of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* ; but only, in *Exclusion* of *Idols* and *false Gods*, it might *ad Hominem* be sufficient : But without putting off Mr. P. thus, 'tis certain, that these Texts, (however unanswerable they may be thought by some) will never prove, nor were design'd to prove,

prove, what Mr. P. brings them for. Thus, the meaning of that Text, *John v. 37.* can't be, that the *Voice* of the Father was never heard. This is not true: for it was heard both at our Saviour's *Baptism* and *Transfiguration*, *Mat. iii. 17. Mat. xvii. 5, 6.* In one Place it is, that, *there was a Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* In the other place it is, *that a bright Cloud overshadowed them,* (such, 'tis likely, as had been formerly the Symbol of the divine Presence) *and behold a Voice out of the Cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him.* This Voice, 'tis said, was heard by the Disciples. And St. Peter says expressly, *2 Pet. i. 17. that this Voice was heard by them.* We have a Passage much to the same Purpose, *John xii. 28, 29. Father, (says our Saviour) glorify thy Name. Then came there a Voice from Heaven, saying, I have both glorify'd it, and will glorify it again. The People therefore, that stood by and heard it, said, that it thundred: Others said, an Angel spake to him.* 'Tis undeniable, I think, that the Voice that came from Heaven these three times, was the Voice of the Father. And therefore, what our Saviour means, is, that tho' the Father had born witness to him by a Voice from Heaven, *v. 37.* yet seeing those *Jews*, to whom he spake, did not probably hear it; nor had been, or were ever likely to be favour'd with such a Privilege, as to hear the Voice of God, as their Fathers did, *Deut. v. 24.* He did not insist upon that, as an Argument of his being the Saviour of the World; but refers them to his Works, which bore witness of him; and to the Scriptures, which would strengthen this Testimony, *v. 36, 39.* As to that other Text, *John i. 18.* 'tis known, that many with *Grotius* understood hereby, that no one hath known, with any *Clearness*, before Christ came; who was

always in the Bosom of the Father, the *secret* and *surprising* Counsels of the Father, concerning the Redemption of Mankind; which are now most fully discover'd by the Redeemer himself. This Interpretation is evidently agreeable to the Scope of the Place: but the Phrase may also signify, that no one hath seen the Father, as Christ is said to have seen him, *John* vi. 46. *i. e.* in all his Glory; and so as to be able to speak of him as Christ hath, and can. And in this Sense also, it is true, that God is invisible, and that *no one hath seen him, or can see him*: Such a Sight as this we can't bear, at least in this our *mortal State*. And tho' the Promise to those that *are pure in Heart, is, that they shall see God, Mat. v. 8. See him Face to Face, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. And see him as he is, 1 John iii. 2.* Yet this Sight is reserv'd for the future World: when our *Faculties* will be stronger, and our *Happiness* greater. Then we may promise our selves, that we shall see God, who dwells in *Light inaccessible*, and is invisible, as to what he will then be; and so see him, as neither we, nor any Mortal hath, or can see him in this inferior State. I wonder, that this *natural* and *obvious* Sense of these Passages, should escape Mr. P. and that he after others, and others after him, should lay such Stress upon them as they do. AND whereas, Mr. P. says farther, on *John* i. 18. "That the only true God is there distinguish'd from the only begotten Son." That is plainly his Mistake. 'Tis only God the *Father*, that is distinguish'd from God the *Son*, who is spoken of before in the same Chapter, v. 1, 2, 3, 4. as that *living, glorious, eternal God, by whom all things were made, and without whom was not any thing made, that was made.* And then farther, if the Sense that I have given of these Places, be just; there is no Difficulty in reconciling, how he, who was seen in his humane Nature, the *humble Symbol* of his

divine

divine Presence; should be of the same *Essence* with him, who was never seen in his fullest Glory, but by our blessed Saviour. 'Twas the same God, as to *Essence*, that was seen by *Moses* and the *Israelites*; and not seen by others, in other parts of the World; where yet he was present as to *Essence*. 'Twas the same God that dwelt between the *Cherubims*, in the Cloud of Glory; and that dwelt in other parts of the promis'd Land; and gave sufficient Manifestations of his *Presence*, in other parts of the World. If Mr. P. be able to account for the one; I shall be able by the same Method, to account for the other. And farther; if the Father and Son be not of the same *Essence*, I desire Mr. P. to account for that of our Saviour, *John* xii. 45. *He that seeth me, seeth him that sent me.* And that *John* xiv. 9. *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*

I hope, I have no need to add any thing farther, to shew, that it was the true God himself, and not his *Representative*, that the *Jews* worship'd. They had no *Command*, or *Direction* concerning this. That which I would farther add, is, that the *Jews* worship'd the same God whom they provok'd, resisted and rebell'd against; and that was not the *Father alone, the Son alone; or the Holy Ghost alone*, but all these together; if not under their *distinguishing Characters*, for want of a clearer Revelation, (which yet some believe they did) yet all, as the one living and true God. And thus I understand the sixth of *Isaiah*, as interpreted, *John* xii. 38, 39, 40, 41. and by *St. Paul*, *Acts* xxviii. 25, 26, 27. and this also I understand the lxiii of *Isaiah*, 9, 10. as interpreted by *St. Stephen*, full of the Holy Ghost, *Acts* vii. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52. They are each of them call'd, not only the LORD of Hosts, but the God of *Israel*; who was the *living, and true, and supreme God*, whom the *Jews* were to worship. This is not

doubted by any, of the *Father*: I have largely prov'd it, with respect to the *Son*: and the same is expressly said of the *Holy Ghost*, 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 2, 3. In the second Verse 'tis said, *the Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his Word was in my Tongue*. And that we might know who this Spirit was, 'tis immediately added, *The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, he that ruleth over Men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God*. And this God of *Israel* included, as is now more clearly revealed, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and may now very evidently be gather'd from *Psalms* xcv. compar'd with *Isa.* vi. 63. explain'd by the Passages of the new Testament, just now mention'd. This God, the *Jews* were to worship as God, as a great God, and a great King above all Gods: *As one that made and govern'd the Sea, and dry Land, and all Mankind*. This, I take to be the *Language*, and *Sense* of the old Testament. And tho' in the new, for Reasons best known to God himself, the *Work of Creation* is, sometimes, apply'd more peculiarly to the *Father*: The *Work of Redemption*, more peculiarly to the *Son*: and the *Work of Sanctification*, more peculiarly to the *Holy Ghost*: yet, neither is the *Father* excluded from the *Work of Sanctification and Redemption*; nor the *Son*, from the *Work of Creation and Sanctification*; nor the *Holy Ghost*, from the *Work of Redemption and Creation*. They are indeed, each of them, *Works peculiar, and appropriated to God*. 'Tis none but a God can create: None but a God can redeem: None but a God can sanctify. And he, that either Creates, Redeems or Sanctifies, doth, upon that Account, deserve to be worship'd. And thus we find in the new Testament, they are all to be worship'd: worship'd as our God: for there is, there can be no other Worship, but *Creature Worship, which is Idolatry*.

THAT

THAT the *Father* is thus to be worship'd, is neither doubted by Mr. P. or me. And in my first Reply, I shew'd, that the *Son* is also to be worship'd: and said, that the same might be prov'd of the *Holy Ghost*. To the first, Mr. P. says, p. 61. "That he allows it in all Instances, wherein, by "worshiping him, we worship, *ultimately*, the Father." If then, I take Mr. P. right, we are to worship our Saviour, just as the *Papists* say they do their *Saints* and *Angels*; and, as the *Heathens* say they did their *Dii Medioximi & inferioris Notæ*: and, that the great Difference between us and them, (as he says, p. 61.) is, "That they did it without any "Command, and we according to a Command." Now, that we do it according to a Command, is certain: But this will no more render it *inferior subordinate* Worship; than it will, that which is paid to the *Father*, which is also by the Command of Christ. That which we should attend here, is, the *Grounds* and *Reasons* of the Command; and whether the Worship of our Saviour, could have been commanded at all; unless it had been his unalienable *Right* to be worship'd. There was no Reason for worshiping the *Heathen Gods*: 'Twas sinful to make any thing the *Symbol* of the divine Presence, and pay it any *Homage*; which was one part of their *Idolatry*. *The Stock was a Doctrine of Vanities*, as the Prophet speaks: and therefore, I would not venture to say as Mr. P. doth, that there was no Difference between the *Israelites* worshiping towards the *Golden Calf*, and towards the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*, and towards the *Cherubims*, but only the Command of God. To speak thus favourably of this part of their *Idolatry*, is what I should not care to do: But there was another, and more abominable part of their *Idolatry*, and that which was inconceivably more dishonourable to God; and that was, to apply to their *inferior Gods*, for such Blessings

Blessings as they needed, and such as none but the *supreme God* could give. And here I may venture to say, that God himself could not have so far given up his own *Rights*, and so far prostituted his own *Glory*, as to command it. *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, (says the Prophet) even they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens.* And these are some of the *Reasons* assign'd by him, why we should not worship any but the *LORD*; who is the true God, the living God, and an everlasting King: who made the Earth by his Power, and establish'd the World by his Wisdom, and stretched out the Heavens by his Discretion, *Jer. x. 10, 11, 12.* There may be other Considerations and Reasons, that should induce us to worship God: But the *Object* of our worship, must have this, to make it a proper, and suitable *Object*: And where this is, the *Object* is always suitable; and ought always to be worship'd, whether there be a reveal'd Command for it or no: For the God that doth this, hath, according to the Apostle, an *eternal Power and Godhead.* All the adorable Perfections, that the *Object* of our Worship should have. *Infinite Wisdom* to know our Necessities: *Infinite Goodness* to incline him to favour us: *Uncontroulable Power* to help and succour us: Such Perfections as these our Saviour hath, but not consider'd as to his humane Nature. This hath the Honour of being employ'd by our Saviour now, and so it will, when he shall appear at last, as a visible Judge, to judge the World. This, according to Dr. *Whitby*, on *John v. 22.* may be call'd, "The *Principium quod*, or the Person thus judging, is "the Son of Man, *v. 27.* this Judgment being to "be exercis'd by the Man Christ Jesus, *Acts xvii. 31.* But the *Principium quo*, i. e. the Power, or "the Principle, by which he does it, is the whole "Fulness of the Deity, individually united to his "humane

“ humane Nature, or, *the Word made Flesh*, John “ i. 14.” So that still it is God that governs the World, and will hereafter judge it, and is now, the sole, supreme Object of divine Worship.

IF our Saviour be the Creator of the World, 'tis clear from *Nature and Scripture*, that he is the supreme God, and must be worship'd as such. We have ever argued justly from the visible Creation, that there must be a Being of infinite Perfection: and with this the Scripture entirely agrees. Thus *Nehem. ix. 6.* *Thou, even thou art LORD alone, thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth, and all things that are therein, the Seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all, and the Host of Heaven worshipeth thee, i. e. upon this Account.* So also *Isa. xl. 27, 28.* *Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest thou, O Israel, my way is hid from the LORD, and my Judgment is passed over from my God? Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the Earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his Understanding.* The whole Chapter shews, that the Creation is the proper Work of the supreme God. And 'tis not obscurely intimated, *v. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, &c.* that our Saviour and the Holy Spirit, together with the Father, are this supreme God, this sovereign Creator. 'Tis undeniable, that *he that made all things, is God*: not in a metaphorical and improper, but in the strict and highest Sense: and as the Maker of all things, hath an inherent, unalienable Right to be worship'd. And such must the Right of our Saviour be, because *all things were created by him, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were created by him, as the Cause; and*
for

for him, as the End: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist, Col. i. 16, 17. And, as all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made: As by him also, all things consist; or, are upheld by the Word of his Power; so, we find, that his Claim to worship, is establish'd upon this Foundation. We have both a Form of Worship, and this Reason of it, Heb. i. 10, 11, 12. *And thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: And they shall wax old, as doth a Garment: and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: But thou art the same, and thy Tears shall not fail.*

If nothing particular had been said, or signify'd, concerning the Worship of our Saviour; yet, if we had been certain of this, that all things were made *by him*; and *for him*; his right to Worship, would have been indisputable: and we should have been as inexcusable as the Heathens were, if we had not worship'd him; when we knew him, by the Works of Creation, to be God; and *had not glorified him as God*, by paying him the most solemn Homage; and him only, as being with the Father, and Holy Ghost, (to whom also, the Work of Creation is ascrib'd) the one God, and Creator of all things. And this Mr. P. seems sensible of; and therefore, (after he had deny'd what Bishop Burnet says, that every Act of Worship, external and internal, is directed to him, for this Reason, viz. "That we never direct any Worship to him, as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.") Says farther, p. 61. "That we never direct any Worship to him, as the primary Creator, Upholder, Redeemer and Sanctifier. And that in our Worship, we don't consider him as the one God;

“ God; of whom are all things, and we for him :
 “ but only, as the one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom
 “ were all things, and we by him.

As to Mr. P.'s Exception to what Bishop Burnet says, there's no one but must see, that 'tis very trifling: For, as 'tis evident, that he was no *Sabbellian*, but distinguish'd between the *Father* and *Son*: so he was not so weak as to think, that we are to worship the *Son*, as if he was the same Person with the *Father*. And, Mr. P. might have consider'd, that, according to his Argument, it can't be said of the *Father*, any more than of the *Son*, that every Act of Worship, internal and external, is directed to him. For we never worship the *Father*, as *God manifest in the Flesh*, and him that *purchas'd the Church with his own Blood*: No, but with the Church on Earth, and the Church in Heaven, we ascribe, *Blessing, Honour, Glory and Power*, to him that *sitteth upon the Throne*, and to the *Lamb for ever and ever*. 'Tis thus we worship him, that liveth for ever and ever. And, if Mr. P. had look'd into Bishop Burnet, he might have seen, that he means, that we worship him, as we worship the *Father*: That our *Saviour*, as well as the *Father*, is propos'd to us, as the Object of our *Faith, Hope* and *Love*: as the Person that we are to obey, to pray to, and to praise, p. 48. And can Mr. P. deny this? He can't, in Consistency with the Scriptures: and therefore, methinks it should be to him, as it is to others, a most clear Consequence, that the Person thus worship'd, is God: because Worship, in Scripture, is always confin'd to God; and he will not, and indeed cannot, give this peculiar Glory of his to another.

As to what Mr. P. says, that we never worship our *Saviour*, as the *primary Creator, Upholder, &c.* If he means as the *Gentlemen* on the *Arian* Side do, as I suppose he doth, that we are to worship the

R

Son,

Son, as no other than the Father's *Instrument*, in the Work of Creation, Preservation, &c. I deny it: as also, that there is in this Sense, any primary or secondary Creator, Upholder, Redeemer, or Sanctifier: and say, that if the Son had not a proper Efficiency in Creation, he is no Creator at all; and may not be worship'd as such. And seeing Mr. P. is often calling for clear Scripture; where, I beseech him, doth the Scripture say such an absurd Thing, that our Saviour is an *instrumental Creator*? Is there any such thing said or intimated, *John* i. 3, 10. *Heb.* i. 10. *Col.* i. 16, 17. These Scriptures render it abundantly clear, that our Saviour had a proper *Efficiency* in the Work of Creation: and for any to say that he had not, is in effect, I think, to deny that he was Creator at all. And then, what room can there be for a *ministerial* and *instrumental Cause*, in a *proper Creation*? A ministerial Cause, in producing things out of nothing; in creating the *Souls* of Men; as also, *Thrones*, *Principalities*, *Powers*, or the Orders of angelical Beings, where there is no pre-existent Matter to work upon; is, I think, a gross Absurdity in *Philosophy*, as well as a great Mistake in *Religion*. If our Saviour did properly create all things, he is no *Instrument*: If he be no more than a ministerial instrumental Cause, he is no *Creator*. The Distinction of a primary and secondary Creator, is unknown in Scripture, as well as Philosophy.

THERE are some, I know, that lay a Stress upon this, that God is said to *make all things by Jesus Christ*, and that *by him he made the Worlds*. They pretend, that 'tis signify'd by the Preposition *dia*, that our Saviour had not a proper Efficiency in the Work of Creation: But it shews, what miserable Shifts Men are put to, when they deny our Saviour to be the great Creator of the World, upon such a Foundation as this. The Preposition *dia*,
is,

is in Scripture, apply'd as well to the *Father*, as our *Saviour*; and that, both in Reference to the Work of Creation and Redemption. Thus we have it apply'd, *Rom. xi. 36. For of him, and thro' him, δι' αὐτοῦ and to him are all things.* If this be spoken of the *Father*, (as Dr. *Clark* contends it is) he must be, as well as our *Saviour*, an instrumental Cause; or there can be no stress laid upon the Preposition. 'Tis nothing but a begging of the Question, to say, that the Preposition denotes *Inferiority* in the one Case, and not in the other. And farther, I can't but observe, that as much, or rather, the very same thing, is said of our *Saviour*, that is here suppos'd to be said of the *Father*, viz. *ἐν αὐτῷ, δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰς αὐτόν, i. e. of, or in him, and through him, and to, or for him were all things created, Col. i. 16.* Here are all the peculiar high Epithets, (as Dr. *Clark* calls them) apply'd to the *Son*, that in *Rom. xi.* are apply'd to the *Father*: And what reason then can be assign'd, why they should have a higher Signification in one Place, than they have in another? But farther, we have also the Preposition *διὰ* apply'd to the *Father*, *Heb. ii. 10. Rom. vi. 4. &c.* And this is so clear, that Dr. *Clark* is forc'd to own, that the bare use of the Prepositions, is not of it self a sufficient Foundation for those *Distinctions* that are made by him and others, between the *Father* and the *Son*. And indeed, I don't see, how 'tis possible they should. And therefore, when God is said to *make all things by Jesus Christ*, the meaning must be, that neither are to be excluded, from having a proper Efficiency in the Works of Creation. *What things the Father doth, the Son doth likewise.* They are undivided in their *Nature* and *Operations*.

AND, as the Scripture knows nothing of a *primary*, and *secondary*, or *subordinate Creator*; so neither doth it of a *primary*, and *secondary*, or *subordinate Up-*

holder, Redeemer and Sanctifier. As to the Work of Sustentation, I don't see, how any thing higher can be aid of the *Father*, than is of our *Saviour*: *He upholdeth all things by the Word of his Power, Heb. i. 3.* By him, or in him, *all things consist, Col. i. 17.* the very same that is said of the supreme God, *Acts xvii. 28.* And who is it but the supreme God, that doth or can redeem; or, that *worketh in us both to will and to do, of his own good Pleasure?* Christians are to consider themselves, as Members of the Church of the ever glorious God, *which he hath purchas'd with his own Blood.* And also, as the *Temples of the living God*, because the *Temples of the Holy Ghost.* And therefore, whereas Mr. P. says, "That we are not in our Worship, "to consider our Saviour as the one God, and we "for him; but as the one Lord Jesus Christ, by "whom are all things, and we by him." I say, that we can't consider him as the one Lord, (which, I take to import, an *absolute, supreme Dominion* over all) unless we consider him as the one God. And, is not the Scripture most express, that our Saviour is that God, in, and by, and for whom all things were created? If he be thus represented, as 'tis evident he is, we ought in our Worship to consider him as such: and, 'tis to rob him of his Glory, if we do not.

THE same holds true, if we don't worship the *Holy Ghost.* Concerning the Worship of the *Holy Ghost*, Mr. P. hath little to say: He denies, that it can be prov'd from Scripture, and accordingly calls upon me, p. 61. "to produce any one Passage "in Scripture, that is a clear Evidence, that ever "the *Holy Ghost* was directly address'd in Prayer "or Praise." This also I find insisted on, in the 19th of the *Propositions*, in an anonymous Letter to me. I shall therefore produce some Scripture Evidences, for the Worship of the *Holy Ghost.*

And

And we are not to wonder, if they are not so numerous, as they are for the Worship of our Saviour; because, the *Holy Ghost* is always represented in Scripture, as *God*; and therefore, one that hath an undoubted Right to our most solemn *Adorations*. And yet however, I think, there is enough in Scripture, to direct and determine our Practice in this respect: Besides those Passages then that I have already produc'd from the old Testament, let it be consider'd.

(1.) THAT we are to swear by his Name. This is allow'd by all, to be a most solemn part of *religious Worship*: And 'tis such, we find, as God doth claim to himself. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and swear by his Name: for the Lord thy God is a jealous God among you: ye shall not go after other Gods, Deut. vi. 13, 14, 15.* And so again, *Deut. x. 20, 21. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his Name: he is thy Praise, and he is thy God, which hath done for thee these great and terrible Things which thine Eyes have seen.* Now, besides that the Scriptures make it abundantly evident, that this God who did these things for them, was the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*; we see here, that this part of Worship is appropriated to the God of *Israel*, the living and true God. And, indeed, there is all the Reason in the World that it should, considering what an *Oath* is. That it is a most solemn Appeal to God, as one that searcheth the Hearts, that perfectly knows what is true and false; and can't possibly hold these Sinners guiltless, that take his Name in vain. An *Oath*, then, is one of the highest Acts of Worship, and so esteem'd by all Mankind. If therefore, the *Holy Ghost* be the Object of this, it can't be deny'd, that he is the God of *Israel*, the great *Lover of Judgment*, and *Hater of Iniquity*, the *Sovereign Rewarder*

Rewarder of Truth, and Avenger of Perjury. And that he is the God by whose Name we are to swear, must necessarily be concluded from that of the *Apostle*, *Rom. ix. 1.* *I speak the Truth in Christ, I lye not, my Conscience also bearing Witness in the Holy Ghost.* From this Passage, 'tis plain, that the *Apostle* did most solemnly appeal to the *Holy Ghost*, as well as *Christ*, as the great Searcher of Hearts; that he was under the utmost Concern, about the Happiness and Welfare of his Countrymen the *Jews*. Here's a solemn *Invocation* of the *Holy Ghost*: not as a Creature, (this the *Apostle* abhor'd, and hath enter'd sufficient Cautions against) but as God; to bear Witness to the Truth of what he said; and to avenge himself on him, if it was not true. This therefore, of an inspir'd *Apostle*, being a direct and immediate Application to the *Holy Ghost*; we can't suppose, that ever he would have made it, unless he knew him to be a proper *Object* of *Worship*: Nay, he could not otherwise have made it, without *Sacrilege* and *Idolatry*. And farther, this Application of the *Apostle* to the *Holy Ghost* shews, that 'tis not only warrantable, but a Duty to apply to him in other Cases: and especially, for that *Assistance* of his, without which we can do nothing to purpose, in those Matters that relate to eternal Salvation.

(2.) As Christians are to swear by his Name, so they are to be baptiz'd in his Name. Besides what hath been said upon this Head already, I would observe, that this hath ever been allow'd, to be one of the most solemn and important Parts of our holy Religion. We here recognize the *Father Son* and *Holy Ghost*, as our *Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier*. In Consideration of the Obligations we are under to them, and the Dependance we have upon them, we own them *severally* as God; and *jointly*, as the one living and true God: to whom, all *Faith*,
Fear,

Fear, Love, Adoration, Homage, Service, and Obedience are due. We promise them in the most sacred Manner, that we'll serve them faithfully, equally, only, continually, and that in despite of all Discouragements. We apply to them, as Persons to whom we are infinitely indebted: As Persons from whom we expect our All, and to whom we owe our All. In this part of our Religion, whereby we are enter'd into the Church, we make no Distinction between *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: but regard them as having one *common Name*, one *common Authority*, and as deserving one *common Adoration*. What we promise to one, we promise the other: What we expect from the one, we expect from the other. And as this part of our Religion, ought never to be perform'd without the utmost Solemnity; so 'twas never doubted, that I know of, whether Baptism was a part of Christian *Worship*. We are herein to present our selves, if adult; and Children as parts of our selves, and as far as we are able, as *living, holy, acceptable Sacrifices to God, which is but our reasonable Service*. So that in this part of *Worship*, there is a Conjunction of almost all the *Parts and Branches* of *Worship*; which renders it one of the most solemn Instances of *Worship*, that we offer to God. And what is done at Baptism, is,

(3.) REPEATED with the utmost Solemnity at the Table of the Lord. Here again, we *Sacramentally* devote our selves to *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. We covenant with the same *Persons*, and upon the same *Terms*; and in Expectation of the same *Blessings* that we did in Baptism. And this very probably may be one Reason, why the *Apostle* joins both the *Sacraments* together; and takes Notice of the Spirit, (whom he had spoken of before in the same Chapter, in such a magnificent Manner) as that glorious Person that we are to eye,

and own, and depend upon in both: For by one Spirit, says he, are we all baptiz'd into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 13. We have but one Saviour, one Sanctifier, one Comforter, one Giver of our spiritual Gifts, one God, whom we own, adore, and promise to obey at Baptism; and to whom we vow fresh Allegiance at the Table of the Lord: For which reason we ought not, as the *Apostle* argues afterwards, to be unconcern'd for one another. Thus we pay Homage to the *Holy Ghost*, and enter into Covenant with him in both the Sacraments.

AND this is perfectly conformable to the ancient Practice of the *Jewish Church*. The *Jews*, who had first the Honour of being God's peculiar People; were according to divine Direction by *Circumcision*, the *Passover*, and other *Sacrifices*, to shew, that they had Fellowship with the God of *Israel*: That this was the God that they own'd, and worship'd, and did cleave unto. The *Gentiles* also, tho' they had no such Direction, did yet, by sacrificing to Idols declare, that they had Fellowship with Idols: That these were the *Gods* that they own'd, that they ador'd, that they depended upon. Tho' God could not allow of this Practice, because of its idolatrous sacrilegious Nature; and tho' he did not think fit to continue his ancient Establishment among the *Jews*; yet something like it, and in the Room thereof, and that might be of equal Service and Concern to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, he hath appointed, viz. *Baptism*, and the *Lords-Supper*: that by these, *Christians* might own themselves to be the *Servants*, and *Worshippers* of the true God, the very same God that the *Jews* worship'd; but now more clearly, and distinctly represented, than he was before. In the *old Testament*, we read of God, and the Spirit of God, of *Jehovah*

Jehovah raining Fire from Jehovah; of Jehovah, and the Word of Jehovah; and a great many things to the same Purpose: These things plainly shew, that there is more than one Person in the Godhead; and this was understood by the ancient Jews, and was a part of their Faith. And 'twas this God, as comprehending more Persons than one, that they own'd, ador'd, and presented their solemn Sacrifices to. These things are set in a clearer Light, by Christ and his Apostles: We are now to be initiated into the Christian Church by Baptism, in the Name of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: We are now to recognize our Obligations to this God, as one that hath redeem'd us from Wrath and Hell, at the Table of the Lord: Hereby we declare our Fellowship with the God of Christians, and own our selves to be his Worshipers. There is no doubt but this Sacrament is one of the most solemn Parts of Worship; and that in this, as well as in Baptism, we covenant with the Holy Ghost: which, seeing it can't be done without Adoration, Invocation, and Thanksgiving, therefore I conclude, that the Holy Ghost is the Object of divine Worship.

THIS will be farther evident, by considering,

(4.) WHAT is allow'd under the 19th Preposition before-mention'd, viz. that we are to bless in the Name of the Holy Ghost. This is according to the Direction of the Holy Ghost himself, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all, Amen.* If we take this, as we commonly do, to be a particular Direction to Ministers, how they ought to behave in the Church of God; so, on their part, 'tis a most solemn Address to God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that they would interest their People, in those great and invaluable Blessings here mention'd. They are to beg of God the Father, that he would make them and their

People, the Objects of his special Love: They are to intreat the *Lord Jesus Christ*, that they and their People may be interested in the Merits of his redeeming Grace; And of the *Holy Ghost*, they are no less humbly and fervently to desire, that he would communicate his *Gifts*, and *Grace* to them, and such as attend their Ministry; That he would sanctify both throughout, and seal them up to the Day of Redemption; and to this end, render all the Ordinances of the Gospel, useful to them: This is the peculiar Work of the *Holy Ghost*. 'Tis he that doth furnish with *Knowledge, Faith, Love, Purity*, and all those other divine Qualities, without which Ordinances can be of no Service; without which, Persons can never be happy in the divine Favour, nor fit for the great and invaluable Blessings of another World. To him therefore, as the immediate *Author* and *Giver* of that Grace, whereby Persons are qualified for the Grace of Christ, and the Love of the Father: To him, as the great and *sovereign Disposer* of Grace, and that giveth to every one severally as he will, Ministers are humbly to apply themselves; imploring, that he would, of his infinite Goodness, bestow this Grace upon them and their People.

WE have much the same Form, *Revel. i. 4. John to the seven Churches in Asia, Grace be unto you, and Peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven Spirits which are before his Throne, and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful Witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* By the seven Spirits here, I apprehend, must be meant the *Holy Ghost*, and not seven created inferior Spirits: because, they are never represented as the *Fountains* of *Grace* and *Peace*: The Churches are never blest in their Name: and because we are expressly caution'd in this Book, and elsewhere, against the worshipping

worshipping of Angels, and other inferior Beings. And it seems a very odd Conceit, that these should here be put in equal Honour with the *Father* and *Son*; nay, and spoken of before the *Son*, if the *Holy Ghost* was not signify'd: That created Spirits should be thus solemnly apply'd to, for the highest Blessings that are given to the Churches, is unaccountable. We have nothing like this in the Word of God. These are ever spoken of as our fellow Servants, and as those that are ready to do Offices of Kindness for us: but never as those, to whom we may apply for Grace and Peace. No, 'tis God alone that is the Giver of these great Blessings, and therefore apply'd to by St. *John*, under the *mystical Character* of seven Spirits, to denote, (as Divines have very justly conjectur'd) that rich *Variety* of Gifts and Graces, that he pours out upon the Churches. To him the inspir'd *Apostle* doth here apply for others: and this shews, not only that we may, but that we ought to apply to him for our selves.

IN the Apostolical Writings, we have, I apprehend, other Instances of the like Application. Thus I understand that of the *Apostle*, *2 Thes. iii. 5.* *The Lord direct your Hearts into the Love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.* By the Lord here, I think, we are to understand, that *Spirit*, of whom I have been speaking; or the *Holy Ghost*, whose proper Office it is to direct us in the way that we should go. 'Twou'd be improper to understand the Words thus. The Lord, who is the *Father*, direct your Hearts into the Love of God the *Father*: Or thus, The Lord Jesus Christ direct your Hearts into a patient waiting for Christ. If the *Apostle* had meant the *Father*, or *Christ* instead of God, he would, most probably, have said himself; and so, instead of Jesus Christ, he would have said, into a patient waiting for himself: But the Propriety of Language seems to require, that he should

mean some other Person, viz. the *Holy Ghost*; who he knew was to lead Sinners into all Truth, and to quicken them to the Love of the Father, and a patient waiting for Christ Jesus. In the same Manner, I think, we are to understand, 1 *Thes.* iii. 12, 13. *And the Lord make you to increase and abound in Love, one towards another, and towards all Men, even as we do towards you: to the end, he may establish your Heart unblamable before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints.* Here again, would be the same *Impropriety* of Language, as I just now took Notice of, unless by the Lord, we understand, the *Holy Ghost*; whose peculiar Office also it is, to establish our Hearts, and make us unblameable in Holiness. According to this Explication of these Texts, we have here direct, and solemn Application to the *Holy Ghost*; that he would direct, establish, purify and quicken Sinners, to the Duties that they owe to God and Men. And this is also a Direction to us, where we are to apply for those Blessings; and to whom we are to ascribe Praise and Glory when we have receiv'd them. And 'tis strange that any should imagine, that the *Holy Ghost* should not deserve the Glory of his own Works; or that any should refuse to render it, if he doth deserve it.

I would hope, 'tis evident from what hath been offer'd, that there is *Worship* due to the *Holy Ghost*; that we not only may, but ought to apply to him for Blessings, that none but God can give. That which I very much wonder at, is, that any should make it a Matter of Dispute, whether we may address the Sanctifier of all Hearts, for sanctifying Grace; or offer Praise to him for any holy Dispositions that may be within us, when they are acknowledged to be his Fruits *. If the *Holy Ghost* be

* Propositions, p. 23, 24.

that God, that worketh in us both to will and to do, of his own good Pleasure; 'tis most unreasonable not to desire it of him, or not to render him a Tribute of Glory and Praise, when it is effected. And by the way, if it be not only Lawful, but a Duty to worship the *Holy Ghost*, in the manner I have mention'd, methinks, it should be no longer a Question what he is, whether he be the living and true God. We can't worship any other, without *Sacrilege* and *Idolatry*: And therefore, we can never suppose, that the *Apostles* would have done it, or, that we should be directed and oblig'd to do so. If the *Father only* was God, he could never suffer any other, how high soever, to share with him in any part of Worship; and be represented, as the *Authors* and *Givers* of some of the highest Blessings that we are made Partakers of. This must unavoidably lead us into dangerous Mistakes: This must countenance us in ascribing the Glory of our *Creation*, *Preservation*, *Redemption*, *Sanctification* and *Salvation* to those to whom it neither is, nor can be due: This would be to teach us to ascribe that to those that are not truly and properly God, which God hath told us, he would not have ascrib'd to such; and which can't, with any Propriety, be ascrib'd unto them, any more than with the Security of the divine Honour: This would be to set up *Idolatry* in the *Church*, when it is one of the chief Designs of the Christian Religion, to root it out of the *World*. This would be, to bring in *subordinate Gods*, to go *Sharers* in Honour and Homage, with him who is the living and true God: This would be to make *Christianity*, a more refin'd sort of *Heathenism*. To discard the old Gods of the *Heathens*, and set up new ones in their Room; *Creatures* in Truth, tho' Gods by Name: which odd, not to say blasphemous Things, I dare not suppose of the great Author of our Religion.

'Tis

'Tis undeniable, I think, that we are to worship the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, as well as the *Father*; to worship them as the one living and true God; as having the same glorious and adorable Perfections; and therefore the same *Nature* and *Essence*; and as doing the same glorious divine Works. Mr. P. is pleas'd to ask, p. 63. "What I mean by their having the same glorious Perfections?" To satisfy him, that which I mean is, that they are all represented and spoken of, as having those Perfections, which none but the supreme God can have, viz. as being *Jehovah*, and therefore necessarily existent; as *Infinite*, *Omnipresent*, *Eternal*, *Unchangeable*, as infinitely *Wise*, *Powerful*, *Holy*, *Just* and *Good*. They are represented also, as displaying these Perfections in the Works of Creation, Providence, Redemption and Grace; and on that Account, deserving to be apply'd unto for all Blessings, by all Persons, in all Places, and at all Times: And this evidently shews, that they are one God; because, there can be no other than the one living and true God, in whom these Perfections are found, in whom we may confide, and to whom we may apply for what we need. Nor do I see, what can possibly be said to excuse it from *Idolatry*, when the most solemn Application is made to any but the supreme God, for all the greatest Blessings that we receive, or need; Grace, Pardon, eternal Life, &c. The Object that we thus apply to, must be regarded as the Searcher of all Hearts, as the Giver of all Mercies, as present with us in all Places. 'Tis both foolish and wicked, dishonourable to our Maker, and condemn'd by Christianity, to call on him that we don't, and can't believe to be God. If our *blessed Saviour* was not so, we could not be oblig'd to honour him as we do the *Father*. Mr. P. is pleas'd to ask here, whether I can suppose, that the *As* here, denotes an Equality of Honour? I answer, that

Some of his *Racovian Friends*, (how inconsistently with their own Notions, I don't say) have thought so. From these Words they endeavour to prove, that *divine Honour* is due to our *blessed Saviour*, because 'tis *such as* is due to the Father. From these Words also they conclude, that Christ is to be worship'd with *Invocation*: because, as they say, those that refuse to pray to him, which is the highest Honour that we give the *Father*, don't honour him as they honour the *Father*. By *Prayer*, according to them, we honour the *Father*, as the *chief Monarch* and *Lord* of all things, in whose Power is our Salvation and Destruction: And therefore, by this Act of Worship, we endeavour to obtain from him the Blessings that we need, and a Security from those Evils that we fear: and after this manner they say, we are to honour the Son; or we don't honour him as we honour the Father. And how can it possibly be true, that we worship the *Son* as we worship the *Father*; it we worship the one as the principal, and the other only as the intermediate Cause of our Salvation? If we worship the one as having all Perfections; and the other as having none, but only by the *Gift* and *Courtesy* of the Father. This is not to honour the Son, as we honour the Father, but as one that is infinitely inferior to him: The one is true and *proper Worship*, the other *flat* and *gross Idolatry*.

It is a great Mistake in Mr. P. to imagine, that the Worship that is due to our Saviour, is founded upon the Father's Commission: For, 'tis evident, that this Commission, (let the Signification of it be what it will) doth suppose an *original Right* to Worship in our blessed Saviour; a *Right* establish'd upon his essential Dignity, and those glorious things that are done by him: But tho' our Saviour be so deserving of Worship, as he is our Creator, our Lord and God, which St. *John* had before asserted of him;

him; yet, on Account of the *Obscurity* of his Birth, the *Meanness* of his Circumstances, and his very great *Sufferings*, Persons might be under a Temptation to withhold those *Regards* from him that were his due: And therefore, that his Honour might be effectually secur'd, the *Father* hath quitted, as it were, his own Right; declaring, that he judgeth no Man; and left it to our Saviour to erect a *Tribunal*, to summon the whole Creation to his *Bar*, and to decide the eternal state of Mankind. And this, if any thing, must convince Men, that there can be none higher than him, in whom these *Powers* are found. These *Powers* do demonstrate, that he that hath, and doth exercise them, must perfectly know what all Persons, from the beginning of the World, have been and done: What Talents they have had, and how they have manag'd in the several Circumstances of Life. That there may be a righteous Judgment, the Judge must perfectly know, what *Aims*, what *Ends*, what *Views*, what *Inclinations* all Men have had: What they had to excuse, and what to aggravate their Sins and Provocations. And how can this possibly be known by any but him, who only knoweth the Hearts of the Children of Men? This Knowledge is so perfect, and peculiar to God, that our Saviour would never have claim'd the Honour of it, if he had not been God, and *equal* to the Father. And how unaccountable is it, when our Saviour had a Charge of Blasphemy brought against him, for making himself equal to God; that instead of disclaiming this *Equality*, he should more strongly, if possible, assert it than he had done before? That he should not only go on to assert that he was the *Son* of God; but draw a *Parallel* between himself and the Father? Assert that he had a Power of raising the Dead, *according to the mighty Working of his Hands, whereby he is able to subdue*
all

all things to himself? And that with the Father's *Consent* and *Approbation*; and to the Intent, that Men might be appriz'd of his transcendent Excellencies, and so honour him *as* they did the *Father*: He had the sole Management of the last Judgment in his own Hands; a *Province*, that none but the most high God can be fit for: And if one, infinitely inferior to God, may have such Knowledge, Power and Sovereignty; I don't see, how we shall be able to distinguish between God and such an inferior Being. To have these things that are thus peculiar to God, and not be God; to have these Qualities of the divine Nature, and not the divine Nature it self: If Persons can admit of this, methinks, they should for ever be silent, and make no farther Objections against the *Trinity*, as being a Doctrine that is not comprehensible. There is nothing that I can see in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, that doth clash with our Ideas, as this doth.

'Tis then because our *Saviour* is equal to the *Father*; doth the same Works that the *Father* doth; that we are to honour him as we do the *Father*: And 'tis to convince us of this *Equality*, and this his just Claim to Honour, that the last and universal Judgment is lodg'd entirely in his Hands. The Son's *Right* to Worship, is not establish'd on the *Commission* that he hath from the *Father* to judge the World; but by this *Commission*, his Right is *manifested* and set forth: And this may be some Reason relative to us, why we should worship him; and satisfy our selves that we are safe in doing so; as 'tis, that we should love God, because he first loved us. There is nothing more likely to satisfy the World of his *Equality* with the *Father*, and that his Right to Worship is clear and indisputable; than that he is the Judge of the whole Earth. And this also gives us a clear Account of that Passage, *Phil.* ii. 9, 10, 11. on which Mr. P. seems so

T

much

much to triumph. That this relates to the final Judgment, is clear from what the same *Apostle* says in another Place, viz. *Rom. xiv. 10, 11, 12.* The *Apostle* here puts it out of all Doubt, that what is said, *Isa. xiv. 22, 23.* of the great *Jehovah*, that glorious God, besides whom there is none else, is justly applicable to our *blessed Saviour*: And if it was not, he could not by any means be fit to judge the World. Consider'd then as the great *Jehovah*, he neither is *exalted*, nor capable of *Exaltation*; unless it may be call'd an *Exaltation*, that he doth now appear in all his Magnificence and Glory; and will more publickly, when he comes to judge the World: which in the Time of his Humiliation he did not. But then, as to his *Humanity*, he is wonderfully exalted: In this Sense, *he hath a Name above every Name*, being not only above Men, to whom he was as a Servant here; but also above Angels too. And before him *as Man*, or a visible Judge, must the whole Creation appear, to give an Account to him, as one that hath the fullness of the Godhead in him, to qualify him for that awful amazing Province: And this must effectually take away all the Reproach of his Cross, and all the Meanness of his Humiliation; and abundantly convince the World, that he is the Person that he profess'd, and that his Disciples and Followers took him to be. By this his Honour will for ever be secur'd, and all Mankind be entirely satisfied, that they don't act amiss, in honouring him *as they do the Father*. This shews that he is the *Lord*, the *absolute Lord* of dead and living: and that 'tis his *unalienable Right*, that Blessing, Glory, Honour and Power, should be ascrib'd to him as well as the Father.

AND whereas Mr. P. says, p. 63. "That this Text puts an End to all sophistical Cavilling, about supreme and subordinate Worship." I am clearly

clearly of his Mind; but for a very different Reason; *viz.* because it shews that Christ, notwithstanding his once low and despis'd Condition, is the great Judge of all the Earth; and therefore, the great and ever glorious God, and a great King above all Gods. 'Tis to this God, that all must give an Account of themselves at last; and from him receive their final Doom. This sufficiently shews what he is, and how unreasonable they are, and what a Hazard they run, who go about to detract from *his* Honour, who will hereafter determine and fix their everlasting State. But as to supreme and subordinate Worship, there is no such Distinction that can, I think, be gather'd from these Words: (tho' Mr. P. says, "That if both Kinds are not mention'd here, it is because it is next to impossible that Words should express them.") For if this had been intended, the *Holy Ghost* might have said, that we must worship the *Father* as God, and *Christ* as a Creature: The *Father* with *sovereign*, and the *Son* with *subordinate Worship*. This would have been plain, and what every one might have understood: but the metaphorical Expression of *bowing the Knee*, doth convey no such ~~Expression~~ to us, according to the *Ex-notation* plication that is given of it by the same *Apostle*. Mr. P. therefore, must have some other Text to countenance his Distinction of Worship, a Distinction invented without any Scripture *Warrant*; yea, against Scripture *Direction*; to serve an *Hypothesis* infinitely derogatory to the Honour of our blessed Saviour. And 'tis very much, that it hath not cur'd Men of their *Fondness* for this *Arian*, *Popish*, *Paganish Distinction*; that we are so often directed in Scripture, to ascribe Glory to our *Saviour*, in the same Words, and at the same Time that we do to the *Father*; and that without any Note of *Distinction* or *Inequality*, or the least *Direction* to under-

stand the Words in one Sense, when we address them to the *Father*; and in another, when we address them to our *blessed Saviour*. If these are infinitely disproportion'd as to Perfection, both our *Prayers* and *Doxologies* should be as different as Words and Language can make them: But seeing they are the very same, I must conclude, that the Scripture knows nothing of *subordinate Worship*; and that we should not have been oblig'd to worship our Saviour at all, unless he had been in the *Form of God*, or truly God: that God, by whom all things were made, and do consist. And seeing Mr. P. speaks of the Father, as the *primary Creator, Upholder, Redeemer and Sanctifier*, I can't see why it should, as Mr. P. suggests, p. 62. be more improper in us than it is in him, to address our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, as he doth the Father. If we apply to the *Father*, by the Assistance of the *Father*, as we must, if he be the primary Sanctifier; why mayn't we, with the same Propriety, apply to the *Holy Ghost*, by the Assistance of the *Holy Ghost*? And so, if according to Mr. P. we apply to the *Father*, as *primary Redeemer*, why mayn't we as well apply to the *Son*, as redeeming us by his own Merits? If there be no Impropriety in the one, there is none in the other: let him account for the one, and he'll account for both. But I despair of seeing any tolerable Account from him, or any one else, why we should worship our *Saviour*, or the *Spirit* at all, if they were not God: The Worship would be Idolatrous, and most absurd: 'T would be to worship the *Creature*, besides the *Creator*: which was not tolerable in the *Heathens*, and will ever be intolerable in us, 'till we have a Law to supersede that old Law of Nature, recommended by our Saviour, in his Reply to the Tempter, who would fain be worship'd with subordinate Worship. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him*

him only shalt thou serve. This is such a *fundamental Law*, as I think can never be cancell'd, or contradicted by any positive Law: and should, methinks, (to borrow Mr. P.'s Expression) put an utter End to all sophistical Cavilling, about supreme and subordinate Worship.

AND thus, I hope, I have been as distinct as Mr. P. can desire, in considering what he says about Worship. And if he would say, as his Friend Mr. Emlyn doth, ("That he would give up the Cause, if " it could be prov'd from Scripture, that the Worship due to Jesus Christ, is ever grounded upon " his supreme Dominion, or infinite Perfection.") I should flatter my self, that I had gain'd my *Point*; and should have no farther *Controversy* with Mr. P. upon this Head. I have drawn out this Argument to a great Length, not only to shew, how well our Doctrine about the Divinity of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost* is establish'd; but also to satisfy the World, that 'tis not about some little useless Speculations, that our Difference is, but about a Matter of infinite Importance. The *Controversy* between us, in plain Terms is, whether God alone is to be worship'd, or God and the Creature. If the latter be true, Mr. P. is in the Right: and either Creature Worship is not *Idolatry*, or *Idolatry* under the Gospel is no Sin. But if the former be true, *viz.* that God alone is to be worship'd, as I have endeavour'd to evidence; then *Idolatry* is what the Scripture says of it: and it is the near Concern, not only of *Ministers*, but of *every Christian*, to keep it from breaking in upon the Churches. And if Mr. P. and his Brethren shall attempt to bring it in, *Ministers* especially, would be too much wanting to the Honour of God, the Credit of Religion, and their own and others everlasting Interests, if they should not endeavour, by all Christian Methods, to keep it out.

W H E T H E R

W H E T H E R Mr. P. had said any thing about the Satisfaction of Christ or no; there was Reason sufficient, from what Mr. *Emlyn* and some others had said, to say, not only that there was an Alteration made in the Point of Satisfaction; but that this important Article of the Christian Religion was deny'd. Whether any had a particular Eye to a Sermon Mr. P. had preach'd upon that Head, as he suggests, p. 65. I can't say: but can be sure for my self, that I had not: However, seeing Mr. P. speaks of that Sermon, he must (by the way) give me leave to question, whether he spake as he thought, and with that *Sincerity* that a Minister should in that Sermon, and other Discourses on the same Subject. There is hardly any one, I believe, that sees that Sermon, and some other things that Mr. P. hath deliver'd since he hath chang'd his Notions, but would believe, that he held a *proper Satisfaction*; a Satisfaction made to divine Justice, and such as none but the great and eternal God himself, by an amazing Condescension, could make. Why else should he lay such Stress on that Text, "*Heb. ix. 13, 14.* and ascribe the Efficacy " of Christ's Propitiation, to the Dignity of his " Person, as well as the Appointment of the Fa- " ther? Why else should he say, that Justice did " oblige God to secure his own Honour and Glo- " ry, and the Reputation of his Government? " Why should he say, that tho' he would not dis- " pute, whether God might have been reconcil'd " without a Satisfaction; yet it seem'd not so well " to comport with the Perfections of God, the " Glory of his Attributes, and the Reputation of " his Government, to pass by Sin without a valu- " able Consideration*? And why should he also

* Western Inquisition, p. 18, 19, 22, 23.

“ say, at other times, that the Sacrifice of Christ,
 “ was infinitely meritorious? and that the Body
 “ of our Saviour was infinitely dignified? That it
 “ was an incarnate God, the King of Heaven, and
 “ Lord of Glory, that did hang and die on an ac-
 “ cursed Cross? Why should he say, that it was
 “ an amazing Substitution, that our Saviour should
 “ take upon him a Body and Soul, and be wound-
 “ ed and bruised in it for his own Creatures? That
 “ he should do all this, *to whom the Nations are as*
 “ *a Drop of the Bucket, and counted as the small*
 “ *Dust of the Balance. He, before whom all Na-*
 “ *tions are as nothing: and Vanity who sits on the*
 “ *Circles of the Earth, and the Inhabitants of the*
 “ *Earth are as Grasshoppers.*” Is not this the very
 Language that the Scripture useth of the supreme
 God? *Isa. xl. 15, 17, 18, 22, 25. The God to*
whom none can be like or equal, the everlasting God,
the Lord, the Creator of the Ends of the Earth, v.
25, 28. What higher thing can be said of the Fa-
 ther, than is here said of our blessed Saviour? And
 if Mr. P. did not think all the while, that it was
 justly applicable to him, who dyed to satisfy divine
 Justice, why did he go about to deceive his Peo-
 ple? and lead them to believe by this Language,
 that our Saviour was God most high: one God with
 the Father, as he must, if these things can be truly
 said of him? Can this Language be us'd of an infe-
 rior God, one that's infinitely inferior to the most
 High? Doth not this Language bespeak the tran-
 scendent Dignity of our blessed Saviour? Must not
 Mr. P. believe, that the People would understand
 it in this Sense? And therefore, seeing he did not
 all the while look upon our Saviour, to be any o-
 ther than a subordinate God; where's the *Sincerity,*
 or *Faithfulness* of it, that he should suffer the Peo-
 ple to go on in a Mistake; talk of the Person, and
 Satisfaction of Christ, as others do, and all the
 while, mean nothing less. I

I am apprehensive, that Mr. P. will find it difficult to acquit himself of *handling the Word of God deceitfully*: Tho' it was necessary to speak after this Manner, to make it to be believ'd, that he held the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction. For what Satisfaction can there be to the Justice of God, but a Satisfaction of infinite Worth? And by whom can such a Satisfaction be made, but by one that's infinitely Worthy and Perfect? If our Saviour be thus infinitely Perfect, he must even, according to Mr. P.'s, and every one's Notion of Infinite, when it relates to the Perfection of any Being, be God most High, than whom none can be higher or greater. If our Saviour be not infinitely Perfect, what can He be more than Finite, and Created? And how can Satisfaction be made, and a valuable Consideration be offer'd to divine Justice by such a one? A Satisfaction to Justice, is a proportionable Satisfaction: A finite Satisfaction, is no Satisfaction to an infinite Being; and for endless, or infinite Miseries. And for this Reason, among others, I take it to be said, *that it was not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sin*, Heb. x. 4. all the legal Sacrifices were too imperfect to satisfy divine Justice. The Punishment deserv'd by Sinners, was infinite or everlasting; to which nothing but a Sacrifice of infinite Value could be proportion'd. Mr. P. may call this loose Talk, and make me as mean as he thinks fit, in the Opinion of his Readers: but as the Perfection that hath no Bounds, is said to be infinite Perfection; That Extension that hath no Limitation, an infinite Extension: so that Duration that hath no end, is an infinite or boundless Duration. And this Duration, as it agrees with Angels and Men; so it may be said, I think, without any Impropriety, that they may be infinitely, because eternally miserable. Infinite, I think, is properly that which hath no Bounds: If

apply'd

apply'd to Perfection, 'tis the same with Absolute: If to Extension, 'tis the same with Immense: If to Duration, 'tis the same with Eternal. 'Tis an eternal Misery we deserve, to which nothing can be proportion'd, that we may obtain Deliverance from it, but infinite Perfection. This is what I meant, and what Mr. P. can't mean. And as to Satisfaction, the common Notion, or the Socinian Hypothesis which denies all proper Satisfaction, must, I think, be true. Mr. P. plainly dislikes the first, tho' he sometimes useth the common Language: In some of his Discourses, he seems to dislike the Second: but won't vouchsafe to mention a Third. I urge him therefore with these Questions, did Christ satisfy divine Justice, or did he not? Did he satisfy it as a merely finite Being, or as one that's infinitely Perfect, by assuming and dignifying the humane Nature? If Mr. P. will be fair, let him be open, and then 'tis possible, that things may be brought to some Issue.

I shall be very glad, if it appear, that Mr. P. and his Brethren have that Veneration for *Scripture* that he pretends, p. 66. &c. Such a Veneration for Scripture they have profess'd; nor will I presume to say, that they han't been sincere in this Profession. This, I know very well, that many would not bear it, should they openly attack the sacred Scriptures as the *Deists* do. And were not Mr. P. and others sensible of the same thing, they would never have rais'd such a popular *Clamour* against us, as if we would not stand to the Determinations of the *Bible*, when they must be convinc'd, at the same Time, that we should never have had any *Controversy* with them, if we had not taken their Notions, to clash with that which we take to be the infallible, and only Rule of *Faith* and *Manners*. 'Tis a great Satisfaction to me, that in an Age of so much *Libertinism*, there are such

Numbers still that are so Zealous for the Scriptures, that the Cause of *Deism* or *Infidelity* can't be promoted, but by a seeming Veneration for them. I hope Persons will ever keep up this just Regard for Scripture: And yet, 'tis certain, that a perverse Interpretation of Scripture, hath a Tendency to sink Man's Regard thereto. There is hardly any Doubt to be made, but the *Papists*, by their notorious Abuse of Scripture, to favour their superstitious and idolatrous Worship, have made not only a great many *Deists*, but *Athiests* too. It can't indeed, but tend much to sink the Reputation of Scripture; when it is pretended, that it favours the Notion, that there is a God by *Nature*, and a God by *Office*; the one Infinite, the other Finite; the one Independent, the other Precarious; the one Supreme, the other Subordinate; the one *properly God*, the other *really a Creature*; and yet both to be address'd in religious Worship, for the same Blessings, and in the same Expressions.

WHAT Bishop *Burnet* says upon this Head, in his four Discourses, hath, I think, a great deal in it; and for the good Sense and Spirit of it, I shall transcribe it. "It will be very hard, (says he) to preserve any Respect for Writings that are fill'd with such Intimations of so important a Doctrine as that of the *Trinity*, all which at first View, seem to carry a Sense, which they, (meaning the *Unitarians*) judge Monstrous and Impious; and that with much Labour and Difficulty, are wrought to another Sense. It will not be easy to think, that these Men had the common Degrees of Honesty and Discretion, not to speak of Inspiration, who write in such a *Stile*, with such Phrases, and in such a continued Strain, that ordinary Readers must stumble in every Step, and that in a Point of such vast Consequence, as whether a *meer Creature*, is the great and true God, or not?"
and

“ and that a great deal of Dexterity and Diligence
 “ is necessary to give them another Sense. I must
 “ own, that if I could think so of the Scriptures,
 “ I should lose all Esteem for them; and could think
 “ no other of the Penman of them; but that their
 “ great Affection for their Master, had led them
 “ to say many things concerning him, that were
 “ Excessive and Hyperbolical, and not strictly true.
 “ This is Literally, says he, and without any Ag-
 “ gravation, the Sense that I have of this Matter:
 “ and the profane Tribe of *Libertines* go all into
 “ this of laughing down all Mysteries; knowing
 “ well, that when once they have gain’d that Point,
 “ the new Testament it self will be laugh’d down
 “ next; in which they are so plainly contain’d.
 “ And indeed, the Christian Religion must be the
 “ most self-contradictory of all the Religions in the
 “ World, since it doth so often condemn the
 “ Worship of Creatures, and yet heap all sorts of
 “ divine Honours upon a Creature: And St. *John*
 “ must be a most incongruous Writer; who could,
 “ at the Conclusion of his first Epistle, say of Christ
 “ Jesus, This is the true God, and eternal Life:
 “ and in the very next Words add, Little Children
 “ keep your selves from Idols; when in the very
 “ preceding Words, he had been setting them on
 “ to it, if St. *Paul*’s Definition must hold true,
 “ that Idolatry is a Service to those that by Nature
 “ are no Gods.

THIS Language, ’tis likely, may not be plea-
 sing to Mr. *P.* who pretends, p. 67. that all the
Unitarians put together, *i. e.* *Arians*, *Socinians*,
Sabellians, &c. han’t done so much to sink the Re-
 putation of Scripture, as those that have held the
Father, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* to be the one God:
 But why should this sink the Reputation of Scrip-
 ture? If it be said, that this is what we are not
 able to comprehend: I answer, if this be a Reason

for any to think meanly of the sacred Scriptures; there is the same Reason why we should think contemptibly of them, because they speak of the infinite Nature and Perfections of God; which are the very Foundation of all Religion. We are no more able to comprehend these, than we can the Unity of the divine Nature, in three Persons. They are both above our Comprehension, and can't be otherwise; and for that Reason, we may innocently call them *Mysteries*. The Scripture is most express in this, that there is but one *Jehovah*, one *Creator*, one *Object of Worship*, one *God*: and yet, all these are clearly asserted of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. If then the Father be *Jehovah*, the Son *Jehovah*, and the Holy Ghost *Jehovah*; and yet, *the Lord Jehovah is but one Lord*; what is it that is asserted by us *Trinitarians*, that can't be express'd in the Words of Scripture? Again, if the *Father* be *Creator*, the *Son* *Creator*, and the *Holy Ghost* *Creator*, and yet but one *Creator*: And so again, if the *Father* be *God*, the *Son* *God*, and the *Holy Ghost* *God*, and yet notwithstanding but one *God*; in what doth the Language of *Catholicks* differ from the Language of Scripture? Here is no straining of Texts: No labour'd *Criticisms*: No far fetch'd Consequences. The Language is Scriptural as well as the Sense.

ACCORDING to the receiv'd Doctrine, we are not oblig'd to talk of ministerial, or metaphorical Creators: of subordinate Deities, and subordinate Worship: of a God that hath the Attributes and Perfections of God, and yet not the Nature of God: of a God by positive Institution, &c. 'Tis no wonder that Men are shy of giving the Sense of Scripture, when they put such unnatural Interpretations upon it. According to this Rate of Interpretation, there is no *Article* of Faith, how important soever Mr. P. will allow it to be, but may

may be interpreted away, and so the Scripture's rendered useless. What if any should, with the *Marcionites* of old, deny God to be the Creator of the World; and interpret the first of *Genesis*, as *Socinus* doth the first of *John*? There is, for ought I see, the same Reason for understanding one of the beginning of the *Mosaical*, as the other of the *Christian* Dispensation: But both Interpretations are forc'd, and violent, and serve to weaken the Authority of Scripture. And is not the *Arian* Interpretation of the Texts, I before-mention'd, as forc'd as these? To pass by these, and a Multitude of other Scriptures, can any thing be more unnatural than Dr. *Clark's* Interpretation of *John* iii. 13? The plain and obvious Sense of this Text is, that our Saviour assum'd the humane Nature, tabernacled in Flesh, and so might be said to come down from Heaven; yet not so, but that he was in Heaven still, being that glorious Person that fills Heaven and Earth: But Dr. *Clark's* Interpretation is, the Son of Man who is in the Prophecy, *Dan.* vii. 13. represented as being in Heaven, or as coming in the Clouds of Heaven. The learned Doctor should never have charg'd the *Socinian* Interpretation of the Passage, as groundless and unreasonable; unless he had given a better one himself: I think they are both alike unreasonable, both strain'd to serve an Hypothesis against our Saviour's divine Immensity. And really, I am of A. B. *Tillotson's* Mind, that it is much fairer to reject the divine Authority of a Book, than to use it so disingenuously.

Let Dr. *Clark*, and Mr. *P.* after him, plead never so strongly for the Authority of the Scripture; yet when they shall resolutely and violently, and by much *Art* and *Criticism*, explain away the obvious Sense of the plainest Texts; they bring the whole into Uncertainty, and give too much Oc-
casion

casion to *Deists* to triumph, that their Cause is so well serv'd. If *Dr. Clark* hath done Service to the Cause of Religion before, this won't excuse him from befriending the Cause of *Deism* now: He hath done, I think, much greater Disservice to the Interest of Religion, by his latter Performances, than he hath done good by his former. But let this be as it will, 'tis evidently to serve the Cause of *Deism*, when we don't treat the sacred Scriptures with the Respect that is due to the *Oracles* of God; and think it sufficient to reject any Doctrines therein deliver'd, however plainly reveal'd, if we are not able to comprehend them.

SHOULD any one say as *Socinus* doth, that if not once only, but often, it should be written in the sacred Scriptures, that Christ made Satisfaction for Sins; he would not therefore believe that the Matter is so; and that the greatest Force is to be us'd with Words, rather than take them in such a Sense: This, I think, would be to serve the Cause of *Deism*, tho' a Veneration for Scripture was still pretended. For, if Texts of Scripture may be thus rack'd and tortur'd, till they are forc'd to speak as we would have them, and contrary to their most obvious Sense, to what valuable Purpose can the *Bible* serve? And for those to cry the *Bible*, the *Bible*, that thus interpret Scripture without any Candour or Simplicity; is much like the *Jews* crying, *The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord*, whilst they were continually profaning it by their Wickedness. If the *Bible* contain the Religion of *Protestants*, or rather *Christians*, as undoubtedly it doth, let it be decently treated, and not forc'd to speak what it never intended. Such forcing of Scripture, is to undermine it, whatever Veneration is express'd for it. And this, I can't question, the *Deists* are sensible of; and are therefore so hearty for the *Gentlemen* of the new Scheme.

As

As to the Case of *Liberty*, 'tis the same now that
 ver it was: None are more zealous for it, if right-
 ly stated and understood, than we are. And there-
 fore, if ever we deserv'd their Friendship upon that
 Account, we deserve it still: But every where, they
 are grown inveterate against us. And why is this,
 but because we won't betray our *Bible*, and surren-
 der up our Christianity, as they probably think o-
 thers have done?

WHAT I said of some *Unitarians*, that they did
 not only question the Authority of particular Texts,
 but raise Objections against entire Books, &c. is
 most true: but I did not know that Mr. P. did
 herein agree with his great Friend Mr. *Whiston*,
 whom I had principally in mine Eye: and there-
 fore had no Design to raise an Odium against him
 or his Brethren, as he suggests, p. 69. Both he and
 they, for ought I know, may be clear as to this:
 and therefore, I shan't charge them till I know
 them better: But as to other *Unitarians*, the Case
 is clear: and if Mr. P. would have said any thing
 to the Purpose, he should have vindicated them;
 or own'd, that these *Unitarians*, of whom I speak,
 do weaken the Authority of the sacred Scriptures.
 And so also do these, I think, in some lower Mea-
 sure, that without more substantial Grounds than
 I have yet seen, do discard 1 *John* v. 7. from the
 Canon of Scripture. That which Bishop *Burnet*
 says of it is *, "That he is not so fully persuad-
 "ed of its being Authentick, as some are; but
 "that however, there are very considerable things
 "urg'd to support its Authority; and that the
 "main Ground of doubting about it, is the Silence
 "of the Fathers in their Disputes with the *Arians*
 "and *Macedonians*." Now if this (by the way)

* Exposition of Articles, p. 40.

be true, I can't see that there is any great Force in such a negative Argument: but this others say is a Mistake. Mr. *Pool*, in his *Criticks* says, that it was us'd by *Athanasius* to prove his Opinion; which was, that there were three Persons in the Godhead, and yet but one God. And farther he says, that it was produc'd also by *Ithacius*, against the *Arians*. If Mr. *Pool* be right, then Bishop *Burnet* might have been said to be rather for, than against the Text: But if either He, *Beza*, or Mr. *Baxter*, who are brought in by Mr. *P.* as rejecting a Passage that they only doubt of, should be for discarding any Parts of Scripture without Ground, as I think, is the Case here; I could no more excuse these excellent Persons, than I can Dr. *Clark*, Mr. *Whiston*, and Mr. *P.* from weakening Men's Faith in the sacred Scriptures. 'Tis a Boldness in *Criticism*, that must do Mischief to Christianity, when one shall criticize away one part of the sacred Canon; and another, another part that they don't like. If this Liberty be allow'd, there are some *Criticks*, who seem to have so little Regard for the Christian Religion, that by taking away some Passages, and forcing others to speak against their most obvious Sense, we shall have but little *Christianity* left; no more than a *Deist* could dispense with.

THERE is no doubt, but according to Mr. *P.* p. 69. we may explain one Text of Scripture by another: but to interpret these Scriptures that speak of our Saviour's being God, and the Creator of all Things, as importing no more than a God by Office, and a Metaphorical, or improper Creation; is to sink the Reputation of the Scriptures by the Subtleties of *Criticisms*. The Scripture is express that the Word is God, and that by this God all Things were Created. He was God before there was any Creature, or could be said to sustain any ^{that} Office; the great God gave Being to all Creatures. And

And 'tis because all things were made *in him*, or *by him*, that they are made *for him*; to declare his *eternal Power and Godhead*, and that they might glorify him as God. Nor could our Saviour have been the *Heir* of all things, which is what Mr. P. understands by that Text, that *all things were made for him*; unless he had been the Author, and Efficient of all things: He is therefore *Heir* or Lord of all; *because he laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of his Hands*. And let any one but read Dr. Clark's, and the Author of the Collection of Queries, &c. Exposition of the Texts of the old Testament, that speak of the great Self-existent *Jehovah*, and are apply'd to our Saviour in the new; And it must be clear to him, beyond all Contradiction, that these Texts, as I say, are no otherwise apply'd by them, than by way of *Allusion* and *Accommodation*. They say, in so many Words, that these things may be said of our Saviour, tho' he be not the great *Jehovah* himself; because he represents him, and acts in his Name. And even Mr. P. himself speaks much after the same Manner, in this Performance of his that I am considering, to the no small Disparagement of the sacred Scriptures. And what if some things are hard to be understood that the Prophets have said, and the Apostles refer to, it doth not follow that all are so. And why Mr. P. should make such a Difficulty of understanding *Hos. xi. 1.* compar'd with *Mat. ii. 15.* I don't apprehend: For to me 'tis clear, that what is here said by the Prophet, tho' it had some Reference to the *Jews*; yet it had its full Accomplishment when Christ came out of *Egypt*, and not till then.

MR. P. whatever he pretends, hath no great Reason to boast of his Reverence for the Scriptures, nor indeed for Religion in general; when he'll receive and believe nothing but what he is able to

W

understand,

understand; except some *dark Prophecies* of Scripture; and other Texts of the Bible, which, whatever they may be, can have no *Reference*, as is evident by what follows, to Matters of Faith. Mr. P. says, p. 70. "That he can't see, how we can believe any thing which we can't understand." I would fain know then, whether he does not believe the infinite Nature and Perfections of God: and if so, whether he hath a Mind, that is able to grasp and comprehend this: which, because infinite, must for that Reason be incomprehensible to every finite Understanding. Again, I would fain know, whether Mr. P. doth not believe, that God is a necessarily existent Being? But now, what Notion hath he, that any thing should be of it self, or without any Cause of its Being? and yet, we are unavoidably forc'd to allow, that God is such a Being. Again, I would willingly know, whether this necessarily existent Being, is not the *Cause* and *Creator* of all other Beings? We can't help believing that it is so: and yet, I presume, Mr. P. won't pretend to understand, how any thing should be produc'd out of nothing. Once more, I would fain know of Mr. P. whether he doth not believe God's *Omniſcience*? Whether he does not believe, that God knows those things *certainly*, on which he can have no *causal Influence*; particularly, that the *Jews* would *crucify the Lord of Life and Glory*: and that *false Teachers* should *arise*, who *privily* should bring in *damnable Heresies*, even denying the Lord who bought them, and that *many* should follow their *pernicious Ways*. But can he pretend to understand, how God doth *certainly* know these things which have such uncertain Causes? This is such a *Mystery* as can't but puzzle and confound us: and yet, 'tis too daring to say with the *Socinians*, that God hath no certain Knowledge of these things.

I might put the like Questions concerning God's *Omnipresence, Eternity*, and other Perfections, concerning which, we have abundant Evidence that they belong to God: and yet there are not, that I know of, more *mysterious Depths* in the Doctrine, of the *Trinity*, than there are in these. So that, if it be a sufficient Reason for rejecting any Doctrine that 'tis incomprehensible; Mr. P. must reject upon this Foundation, not only a great part of *reveal'd Religion*, but of *natural Religion* too. And what Presumption is it for any to pretend, that they know all the real Distinctions that are consistent with the Unity of an infinite Being? If Mr. P. wants to know, 'tis this *Boldness and Pride of vain Man, who is of Yesterday, and knows little or nothing*, and yet would grasp at every thing, and reject what 'tis not able to take in; 'Tis this *Pride and Arrogance*, that hath given so much Advantage to *Deism*, and sunk Christianity to its present low Condition: And without a Spirit of Prophecy, one may venture to say, that unless some are more humble and modest than they have been of late, Christianity will sink yet lower; and *more Novices being lifted up with Pride, will too probably fall into the Condemnation of the Devil*.

I am at a Loss for the Evidence that Mr. P. p. 70. says there is, that he hath had no Hand in the Divisions that are among us: Let any one read the first Part of his *Western Inquisition*, and then believe it if they are able. We were most quiet and harmonious till Mr. P. came among us: and if some had imbib'd the *Arian Notions*; yet, if they had not had one of Mr. P.'s *Weight and Spirit* to head their *Party*, I must think, that they would either have cashier'd their Notions, or kept them to themselves: Fortho' I can easily allow, that some things are true that Mr. P. says of his Brethren; yet 'tis too visible to the World, that he is upon all Oc-

cations consulted as their *Oracle*: and that notwithstanding their boasted *Sense* and *Honesty*, some of them can pin their Faith on his Sleeve: However, this I thought might be imputed not to their want of *Sense*, but their fond *Admiration* of Mr. P. whom I knew them inclin'd to magnify beyond all Proportion. I said nothing of their *Honesty*, *Sense* or *Sobriety*, or how well they would bear a *Comparison* with me or my Brethren: I abhor the *Vanity* of magnifying my self, and the *Baseness* of raking into the *Failings* of others, as some have done: However, seeing Mr. P. compels me, I'll venture to say thus much, that tho' I leave my *Sense* to be judg'd of by the World; yet, I defy *Malice* it self to blemish my *Honesty*, or *Sobriety*; and that I know of none among us, who need be shy of the *Comparison* Mr. P. speaks of. But this, I apprehend, is no part of the *Controversy* that we have with Mr. P. or Brethren; nor is it about *Subscribing*, or *Non-subscribing*; or whether the *Scriptures* be the only *Rule* of *Faith* and *Manners*: The *Controversy* that we have with them, is about the *Trinity*; or about the proper Deity of our *blessed Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*; which we assert, and many, if not all of them deny. And if they did not deny it, what *Reason* can be given why they should clamour so much about those very *human Forms* that they had formerly as great a Fondness for, as containing the *Sense* of the sacred *Scriptures*, as any of us? If these *Forms* were once valuable, why should there such an Outcry be made against them now? If they were once embrac'd, when there was no want of *Regard* and *Veneration* for the *Bible**, why should it be now a *Disparagement* to *Scripture* to contend for them; not as

* *Western Inquisition*, p. 5.

the *Rule* of our Faith, but as expressing the Sense of that *Rule*? And if the going over of some to *Arianism*, hath made this Alteration; I can't see why any should be so much displeas'd with the reproachful *Name*, when they have taken up with the reproachful *Notions* of that *grand Incendiary* of the Christian World.

WE never heard of any Objection against these *Forms*, till the *Arian Notions* were imbib'd, and spread among us. And 'tis probable, that none would ever have been made, if they had not clash'd with these *beloved Notions*: But whatever our Apprehensions of these *Forms* be, I wonder with what *Conscience* Mr. P. can say, p. 71. "That Men are urg'd to contend for these, instead of Scripture." Whatever Mr. P. says, he can't but know, that we have such a Value for the sacred Scriptures, that we like no *human Form* of Words whatsoever, that is in the least disagreeable to the Scriptures: He knows, 'tis our Principle to reject all *Forms* that can't be defended by Scripture: That 'tis to the Scriptures that we bring all *Creeds, Catechisms, and Confessions of Faith*; and so approve or reject them, as we apprehend them to be supported by Scripture or not: But then, if the Scriptures are by any perverted, or misinterpreted; this *Perversion* is not Scripture, but an *Addition* of their own. And can Mr. P. be ignorant, that Men may hold pernicious Errors, and yet discard none of the Words of the *Holy Ghost*? The *Apostle* is express, *that Men may wrest even the Scriptures, to their own Destruction*: And as none are more likely to do this, than those that lean to their own Understanding; so we can't help thinking, that those do it who deny the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, for a Reason, which if allow'd, they might as well deny the *Being and Perfections* of God; viz. because they are not able to comprehend it. In Opposition to those

those that have such a mighty Opinion of their own Capacities, we are willing to submit our own Understandings to the Revelations of Scripture: with these we are willing to stand or fall: by these we are willing to have our Notions try'd. And whatever Mr. P. may talk, our *Controversy*, I hope, would soon be at an end, if he and his Friends were willing to pay the same humble *Deference* and *Regard* to Scripture that we do.

BUT tho' they would be thought to have such an extraordinary Respe^ct for the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, I can't see that they give any great Proof of it; when concerning the Assertions of the *Holy Ghost*, about a Subject confessedly above the Comprehension of finite Beings, they shall take upon them to say, contrary to the plain and most obvious Meaning of the Words, that such a Sense of them, when 'tis evident they can bear no other, is *false, impossible, Nonsense, Contradiction, &c.* Thus they are pleas'd to speak of all the Passages, that are brought to prove the supreme Deity of our blessed Saviour; tho' according to the most natural Signification of Words, nothing less can be intended. Some of the Expressions of the *Holy Ghost* concerning our Saviour are, that he is *God*; the *true God*; the *mighty God*; the *great God*; *over all*; *blessed for evermore*: The *God that made the World*; that *searcheth the Hearts and Reins*: That is *worshipped by Angels*, and ought to be *worshipped by all Mankind*. And can it argue any great Veneration for the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, when these and the like Expressions, which are so peculiar to the most high God, shall be interpreted as importing no more, than that our Saviour is an *inferior Being*; *infinitely inferior* to that glorious Being to whom they belong? To make these Words of the *Holy Ghost*, to signify one thing when spoken of the *Father*; and another thing infinitely different, when spoken

spoken of the *Son*; is in effect, to destroy the use of Language: and is, I think, the highest Disparagement to the Words of the *Holy Ghost*. I think therefore, Mr. *P.* should forbear boasting of his and his Brethren's Regard to the Words of the *Holy Ghost*; when they make the same Words and Propositions, convey Ideas thus infinitely different. In another Author, this would either be censur'd as an *Impropriety* of Language; or else it would be reckon'd as very injurious, to interpret him after such a sort as this. And, I confess, I han't been able to account for it, that such a *Liberty* should be us'd with the Words of the *Holy Ghost*; which would be thought intolerable, if us'd with the Words of a common Author.

IF we take the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, according to their most natural Signification, 'twill be far, I think, from any thing like uncharitable, to represent those as in the utmost Danger, who deny the Godhead of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*. I can't see, that we say any thing of such, but what the *Holy Ghost* hath taught us to say. And I wonder Mr. *P.* should see no Difference between those who leave others to the uncovenanted Mercy of God, for not holding those things that were never thought to be the *Fundamentals* of Christianity; and those who think others to be in the utmost Peril for rejecting these Doctrines that have been thought by all who profess Christianity, except *Arians* and *Socinians*, to be *Essential* thereto. Nor is there any greater Reason why the Church should be a Den of Lyons and Tygers, because of those Censures that are past upon heretical Doctrines; than because of those that are past upon wicked Practices. 'Tis no Breach of Charity, to say of the *Unrighteous*, and particularly of *Idolaters*, that they can't, according to the Covenant of Grace, inherit the Kingdom of God: The *Holy Ghost* hath said

said so much, and yet we mayn't be as Lyons and Tygers to such Sinners. Nor was it ever my Opinion, that we ought to be such towards the most notorious *Hereticks*: We ought not to be as Lyons and Tygers to *Mahometans* and *Heathens*: and yet I don't see, that they have any Covenant Title to Salvation. We must pity and pray for them, and leave them to the Mercy of God, and think as well of them as the Scripture will allow us to think; and if we do, we are not uncharitable: And the same I say of *Arians*, *Papists*, *Socinians*, &c. If I think they don't believe and practice as they should, 'tis what I can't help; nor do I see any Fault in declaring what I think: But should we therefore be as Lyons and Tygers to such Persons, or indeed to the most infamous Sinners? This would be contrary to Charity, and is that which I can't make any *Apology* for.

As for Mr. P.'s being amazed, as he speaks, p. 71. that I should so poorly cite the Scriptures to defend what I say; I am not mov'd by Language so common to the *Party*, who freely condemn all, even those that are vastly superior to me; as ignorant and stupid, if they presume to think, or speak contrary to what these *great Masters of Sense and Reason* do: But it happens, that Mr. P. is amaz'd, without giving any Reason for that Amazement; or offering to shew, that I han't put a just Interpretation upon the Texts I cite. And let me remind Mr. P. that if the *Messiah*, or Saviour of the World, according to Scripture Representation, was to be *perfect God*, and *perfect Man*; that those can't believe him to be what he is, who only believe him to be a *Man*, or some *inferior subordinate Being*. They don't believe what is *essential* to the *Messiah*, and therefore don't really believe him to be the *Messiah*; any more than a Person can be said to believe there is a God, who denies him to be an infinitely

finitely perfect Being. With what Propriety can he be said to believe in God, who denies him to be *Infinite, Eternal, Unchangeable*; to be infinitely *Wise, Powerful, Holy, &c?* These things are essential to the Notion of God; and therefore, if we deny him these Perfections, we can't believe him to be the true God. Nor can we any more believe our Saviour to be the true *Messiah*, when we deny him to be God, if it be essential to him to be so. *Such don't believe the Record God hath given of his Son.* They don't believe our Saviour to be what he is. They deny the *Essence* of Christ; and therefore, according to Mr. *Baxter*, are not Christians in a true and proper Sense. They are much such Christians, as *Mahometans* would be if they would assume the Christian Name. Even these don't deny, that our Saviour was a great *Prophet*, even much greater, as Mr. *Reland* and some others tell us, than *Mahomet* himself. They allow also, that our Saviour was a most excellent Creature, miraculously born of the blessed Virgin, and yet free from Sin: and that he did a great many Miracles: and, for ought I see, this is as high as Mr. *P.* and others will allow our Saviour to be.

If this be the most that Persons will ascribe to our Saviour, besides his *Pre-existence*; in which, indeed, and some other things of no extraordinary Moment, the *Arians* differ from the *Mahometans*: This is nothing so much as he hath ascrib'd to himself, and is ascrib'd to him in the sacred Scriptures. Concerning himself he says, that he was the Son of God; by which the *Jews* understood, that he *made himself equal to God*: Nor doth our Saviour say, that they were mistaken, but rather allows, that what they said was true; and accordingly says, that it was the *Father's Will*, that they should honour him as they did the Father: which could not be, if he had not the same *Nature, Glory, and Per-*

fections that the Father had. In another Conference that our Saviour had with the Jews, he plainly tells them, *that he and the Father were one, John x. 30.* This so inflam'd the Passions of the Jews, that they would immediately have ston'd him for *Blasphemy*; because, as they say, *he made himself God.* Our Saviour allows, that their *Inference* was just; that what he had said was sufficient to make good the *Allegation*, that he was God: But he would by no means allow the *Inference* they would draw from it, that therefore he must be a *Blasphemer*: but appeals to his Works to prove the *Divinity* of his Person, and being one with the Father, *v. 37, 38.* *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not: but if I do, tho' you believe not me, believe the Works, that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* This was the way that our Saviour took to clear himself of the *Charge of Blasphemy*; which was so far from being satisfactory to the Jews, that they thought it to be no other than a *Repetition* of the same *Blasphemy*, with some Aggravations: and therefore, if he had not miraculously made his Escape, they would have ston'd him still: and 'twas for this supposed *Blasphemy* of our blessed Saviour, that the Jews at last crucified the Lord of Life and Glory. But that which they reckon'd *Blasphemy* in him, they should have believ'd. And 'twas because they did not own and believe in him as the *Messiah*, whom according to their own Law they were to receive and trust in as *Jehovah* their Righteousness, *Jer. xxiii. 6.* when he had given so many substantial Proofs of his being this very *Jehovah*, and God with them, that our Saviour tells them, *they should die in their Sins.*

THE Necessity of this Faith our Saviour asserts upon Thomas's declaring, that he was *his Lord and God, John xx. 28.* Had Thomas carried the Character of our Saviour too high, he had always the Honour

Honour of his Father too near at Heart, not to correct his Mistake, and let him know, that he had magnified him to an Excess: But instead of this, he only blam'd *Thomas* for his not believing upon such Evidence as was sufficient to satisfy any reasonable Person, but declares withal, that his *Faith* was right, and that others ought to believe as he did; i. e. that he was the Lord their God, *that they might have Life through his Name*, v. 29, 30, 31. So that the Consequence I draw, is not a *Fancy* of mine; but the Belief of the Deity of our blessed Saviour, is what the *Holy Ghost* hath made so necessary, that I can't see but those must lay themselves open to the utmost Danger that don't believe it: as also do those who ascribe all the Works of the *Holy Ghost*, to a Being that's *inferior* even to an *inferior Being*. Nor can I see, that I have said any thing more severe than some of Mr. P.'s own Friends, even the Gentlemen of *Racovia*, those honest Promoters of Truth, have said of those that deny divine Worship to Christ: They say, that this is in effect to deny Christ; and that they are no Christians who refuse to give him divine Worship: and that this leads to *Judaism*, to *Epicurism*, and *Atheism*.

MR. P. hath done nothing to satisfy me that that Text in *Peter*, 2 *Peter* ii. 1. is wrongly apply'd: For as 'tis evident that it belongs to our Saviour, if we consider how 'tis connected with what is said in the foregoing Chapter: So if any deny what's essential to the *Person* and *Offices* of the Redeemer, they really deny the Lord that bought them; and so are guilty of that damnable Heresy the Apostle speaks of, and lay themselves open to a *swift Destruction*. Whoever the false Teachers were that should bring in this damnable Heresy, they were false Teachers among Christians; some that profess'd the Christian Religion, and in Words own'd Christ to be the Saviour of the World:

But barely to own this in Words, is not sufficient, whilst any *deny Jesus Christ to be their only Master, God and Lord.* This, without the help of any *Criticism*, is the true and proper rendring of *Jude 4th*, and agreeable also to our own Translation; where *x*, which very often signifies *even*, because it can have no Reference to another Person, is rendred *and*. If we understand it so here, as I think we must, notwithstanding any thing that *Dr. Clark* or others have said, which I take to be no other than begging the thing in dispute, then there is no Difference between me and our *Translators*, whom yet I never thought, any more than *Mr. P.* to be inspir'd, notwithstanding his little Insinuations, *p. 74.* And if I have render'd these Words justly, as I can't see but according to all the Rules of *Grammar* I have, then here's a clear and plain Text to shew the vast Danger that those run who deny the *Godhead* and *supreme Government* of our blessed Saviour. And farther, if our Saviour be not God, I want to be inform'd, how he can be the Saviour of Sinners? How he could surmount these Difficulties that stood in the way of our Salvation? How he could make Satisfaction, and thereby lay such a sure Foundation as he hath for our Acceptance here, and everlasting Blessedness in another World? *Mr. P.* can't be ignorant, that Persons may in Words own Christ to be a Saviour, and yet in reality deny that he is so. Thus those are represented as denying Christ, who say, *that Righteousness comes by the Law*; and that Persons ought to be circumcis'd to shew their Subjection thereto. Such are *fallen from Grace*, and *preach another Gospel* from that which is given us as the *Rule* of our Faith. And must not those be said to do the same, who represent our Saviour as not having the same Perfections that the Father hath, and doing the same Works that the Father doth? The *Scripture* is not more

more express, with respect to any, than it is with respect to both these. And time was, when Mr. P. would say the same, even since he hath chang'd his Notions; whether constrain'd by the Force of Truth, or to serve a Turn, he can best tell. Thus speaking upon these Words, *when Jesus perceiv'd in Spirit, that they so reason'd in themselves*, he delivers himself thus, "That it was by reason of his *divine Nature*, that he knew what was in their Hearts and Thoughts. It was, says he, but "come into their Hearts; yet Christ was acquainted with it, and he knew it as he took it to himself, *I am he which searcheth the Heart*; which "is a great Evidence of the *Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ: for God takes this to him as his Peculiar, *Jer. xvii. 9, 10. the Heart is deceitful above all things, &c.* to which, says he, in 1717. "I know I should have been ready to add, that "'tis reasonable to think, that he should know "their Hearts, since he made them." If Mr. P. did not speak as he thought, where's the Sincerity of it? If he did, why are others blam'd that they speak after the same Manner? And much to the same Purpose doth he speak concerning our coming to Christ, or believing in him, on *Mat. xi. 28.* "There "must, says he, be a Persuasion of his Character, "that he is the Son of God. To believe this carries an Acknowledgment of his Power, Holiness, "Justice and Goodness. And as he is possess'd of "these Perfections, he is a fit Object of our Faith; "and on this the Scripture lays a great Stress. He "that pretends he comes to Christ as a *Man*, a "meer Creature, he doth not really come to him "that made the Invitation; for he is more; he is "God. And it is not easy for a Man to persuade "himself, that God would lay the Stress of the "Salvation of all those that should ever come to "eternal Glory, on the Regard they should pay to a
"meer

"*meer Creature.*" Are not these Expressions full for the Necessity of believing in our Saviour as God? This is what I urge; and that 'tis most dangerous to confide in any *finite, dependent* Being, how exalted soever. Mr. P. perhaps may retract this, and so condemn himself for thus imposing upon his People; but how he will be able to answer it, I don't see: Nor hath he thought fit in his Answer to me to let us know, how we can avoid neglecting the *Love, Worship, and Obedience* that are due to God as our *Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier*; or which is the same, as comprehending *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and are requir'd in order to Salvation; if according to the third of these *Propositions* in a Letter to me, "the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ is alone the one God." I know of no Difference the Scripture makes, between the *Love, Worship* and *Obedience* that we are requir'd to pay the *Father*, and that which we are oblig'd to pay our *Redeemer* and the *Holy Ghost*. And this is a farther Confirmation to me, that each is God, and that they are together the one God; on whom we are to depend for *Grace* and *Mercy* here, and *Glory* hereafter.

AND this I take to be the *Faith* that was at first deliver'd to the *Saints*, and hath ever since continued in the Church, tho' Attempts have been made in all Ages to subvert it as well as now. Indeed I can't much wonder, that Mr. P. who speaks so contemptibly of us upon all occasions, should think us weak enough to except the first Ages, p. 74. when we say, "That the *Faith* that we hold is the *Faith* in which the Churches have agreed in almost all the Ages of Christianity." But however, Mr. P. might easily have thought, that as the *Catholic Doctrine* hath always been look'd upon as old as Christianity, and held by the most learned Men to be the Doctrine of the first Ages: So we should

should have chus'd to say nothing, rather than say any thing so absurd, so disparaging to our own Cause, and so reproachful to Christianity. For tho' the *Bible* be the *Rule* by which we judge of the Doctrines of the Church, not only in the present, but primitive Ages; yet Mr. *P.* must think very oddly of us, that we should slur these Ages without Cause; and give up an Argument which so many have defended to the *Shame* and *Confusion* of all its Opposers. I readily agree with Mr. *P.* that in the fourth Century, *Antichristianism* began to come in amain: 'Twas then that *Arius*, that grand and infamous Opposer of Christ, began to spread his *Poyson*, which infected many; and did a great deal of Mischief, thro' the Influence that some cunning designing Bishops had upon *Constantine*, in the latter Part of his Time; and on *Constantius* and *Valens*, who succeeded him: However, this *Heresy* soon met with a noble Opposition, and especially from the *Council of Nice*; which shews, that the Notion was then look'd upon not only as *Pernicious*, but *Novel* too. And Historians tell us, that the Defenders of it would not venture to appeal to *Antiquity*, as knowing, I suppose, that the whole Stream of it was against them.

THIS *Heresy* of *Arius* is what we oppose, as directly contrary to the Faith of the Gospel, and Antiquity. And Mr. *P.* may as well say, that our Faith was not known till the *Reformation*, as that it was not receiv'd for the Substance of it before the *fourth Century*. Nor is it at all material to the Difference between Mr. *P.* and the *Assembly*, whether he propagated his Notions so much before as he hath since. Whoever was concern'd in their Propagation, 'tis known by every Body that they were propagated; and that too by those that were intimate with Mr. *P.* Our Business, as an *Assembly*, was not to enquire whether these were Mr. *P.*'s Notions,

Notions, but to hinder, if possible, their Propagation; not because they were *his*, but because we thought them to be unscriptural, and dangerous. And in this Mr. P. hath obstructed us as much as possible, which shews how near these Notions are unto him.

THE *Assembly*, among other things say, that these Opinions are contrary to the Faith of the Churches, in almost all the Ages of Christianity: And to satisfy Mr. P. that we were not singular in this our Assertion, I mention'd some learned Men that have been great Inquirers into Ecclesiastical Antiquity, as asserting the same that we did: and instanc'd particularly, in the learned Author of the *Critical History* of the *Apostles Creed*, Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Waterland*, and Bishop *Burnet*. Mr. P. says nothing of Dr. *Waterland*, whose Testimonies from Antiquity are so irrefragable, that nothing solid, I think, can be said against them: Nor is there, as far as I can judge, the least Injustice done by this learned Author to Dr. *Whitby*, by the Censures he passeth upon his *Disquisitiones Modestæ*. Let any one read what this learned Gentleman says on *Query 26*, or his late *Defence* of these Censures, or what Dr. *Whitby* himself says in his Tract *De verâ Deitate Christi*; as also what Bishop *Bull* says in his *Defence* of the *Nicene Creed*, and he'll be satisfied, that our Faith is the Faith of the first Ages; and that Dr. *Whitby* hath said nothing to the Purpose to the contrary, or to invalidate what he hath formerly deliver'd on this Subject.

CONCERNING the learned Author of the *Critical History*, Mr. P. is pleas'd to say, p. 76. "That he
"is confident, that that learned Author will never
"be prevail'd with to censure any thing, he hath
"said upon this Argument." 'Tis not my Business to enquire whether he will or no: but if not, I humbly presume to say, that he must retract what
he

he hath said himself upon the Argument: and either allow, that his Opinions are not the Opinion of the ancient Church, which was the only thing I quoted him for, or that these Opinions are not justly represented by him. I have too great an Opinion of this learned Gentleman's *Impartiality*, had I known nothing of the Matter myself, to think the latter: But if notwithstanding, he hath the same Sentiments of these Matters that Mr. P. hath, (which I can hardly suppose) 'tis nothing to me, who quoted him only as representing the Sense of the *ancient Church*, concerning the Divinity of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*; which doth perfectly agree with the Doctrine that is now oppos'd by Mr. P. and others. Thus giving the Sense of the Church, and as any one would think, his own, he says, "That to believe in the Son of God, was requir'd at Baptism; which Appellation of the Son of God denotes, as he says, his divine Nature, as that of the Son of Man implies his Humanity: as was long ago observ'd by *Novatian*, in his Exposition of this part of the Creed, viz. that as our Saviour's being the Son of Man, declar'd his Humanity; so his being the Son of God, is an undeniable Proof of his Divinity: and Christ is not only Man, because the Son of Man; but is also God, because the Son of God *," I leave it to any one to judge, whether this doth not signify, that our Saviour hath the same Nature and Perfections that the Father hath; and that he is more than a God by *Office*: which I take to be Mr. P.'s and the present Notion. And to the same Purpose he speaks concerning the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*. "This Article, he says also, was coeval with Christianity; and the Belief there-

* Crit. Hist. p. 137, 138.

“ of requir’d at Baptism in the ancient Church.” and then quotes a Passage out of *Didymus*, and another out of *Epiphanius*: who, tho’ they both liv’d some time after the *Council of Nice*; yet he speaks of them as delivering the true Sense of that Article that he had just before said was coeval with Christianity, and receiv’d by the *ancient Church*. That from *Didymus* is, “ Who will not from hence, “ (*i. e.* from our being baptiz’d in the Name, &c.) “ conclude the *Equality* of the sacred *Trinity*, seeing there is but one Faith in the *Father*, *Son*, “ and *Holy Ghost* *.” That from *Epiphanius* is, “ That the *Nicene Creed* did condemn the *Macedonian* Heresy: For tho’ that Synod principally “ insisted upon the Articles of Faith relating to “ the Deity of the Son, which at that time were “ impugn’d and deny’d by *Arius* and his Followers: yet nevertheless there was sufficient said to “ declare him, *i. e.* the *Holy Ghost*, to be God, in “ that as we are directed by the Creed, not only “ simply to believe the Father and the Son, but in “ the Father and the Son, terminating our Faith “ upon them: So also are we oblig’d to believe in “ the *Holy Ghost*.” And then this learned Author adds, as from himself †, “ This Criticism, and Distinction of believing, and believing in, is not to be “ despis’d, seeing the *primitive Writers* lay great “ Stress thereon: and do from thence conclude, “ and prove the Divinity of the *Holy Ghost*.” For which he quotes *Ruffinus*, as declaring, that by the *Preposition*, the Creator is distinguish’d from the Creature, and God from the Mysteries reveal’d by God: And this Observation of *Ruffinus*’s, he is so far from objecting against, that no one can think any other from what he says, but that he approves it. And

* Crit. Hist. p. 317, 318.

† Crit. Hist. p. 320, 321, 322.

what

what this learned Author says concerning the Sense of the *primitive Church*, about the Articles of the Divinity of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*; is perfectly agreeable to what he had said in another valuable Work of his*: where he reckons the Doctrine of the Trinity, among the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith; because we are baptiz'd in the Name, and dedicated to the Service of the *Trinity*: And this Doctrine, as he thinks it to be consistent with the Unity of the Godhead; so also to be most agreeable to the Sense of the *ancient Church*, whose Creeds he had before set down. Nor doth he say any thing against it, or in favour of Mr. P.'s Notion, as he doth *artfully*, I may say *unfairly* insinuate. The whole Passage, p. 54. relating to *Ruffin's* Observation, (who is known to have been for the common receiv'd Doctrine of three divine Persons, and one God) is: "For the better understanding of which, *viz.* the Unity of the Godhead, it will be convenient to take Notice of the Observation of *Ruffinus*, that in all the Eastern Creeds it is, I believe in ONE God the Father; where, says this learned Author, "if by the Eastern, he means the *Nicene*, or *Constantinopolitan*, it is certainly true." Now, 'tis known to every Body, that these *Creeds*, as they are not contrary to the more ancient *Creeds*; so they are for the *Consubstantiality*, and made in a direct Opposition to *Arianism*, and *Macedonianism*: For which Reason the *Compilers* of them could not think, that it gave any Advantage to these *Heresies*, thus to express themselves, I believe in one God the Father. And as for that other Passage, p. 63. where Mr. P. says, that this learned Author speaks fully to his Mind. If he had had a Mind to represent the Matter

* Inquis. into the Coast. &c. p. 83.

fairly, he should have told the World; that the inserting of this Passage of the one God the Father, was not in Opposition to the *Catholick Doctrine*; which is not so much as suggested: but in Opposition to the *Polytheism* of the Heathens*; and more especially in Opposition to the *Heresies* of the *Gnosticks*, *Marcionites*, and others; the *Disciples*, and *Successors* of that first grand Heretick *Simon Magus*, as he calls him, p. 64, 65. who held, that there were two Principles, or Gods: the one, the good God, the God of the Christians; and the other, an evil God, the Creator of the World, and the God of the *Jews*: And this is what he largely proves from *Origen*, *Ireneus*, *Tertullian*, &c. who don't exclude the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* from the *divine Unity*; but make them, together with the Father, to be the one God†. Mr. P. I think, ought not to have conceal'd this: nor can I understand the *Honesty* of this Method of quoting Authors, or Sentences out of them, without giving a fair Account for what they are design'd: For after this rate of Quotation, Mr. P. or any other, may make the whole Christian World to be of their Opinion; and that even those that are most against them. Of this Mr. P. after Dr. Clark, hath given a pretty large Specimen in his *Western Inquisition*: and this, tho' it can't deceive Men of *Sense* and *Learning*, and such whose Business and Leisure lead them to look more into those things; yet 'tis such an *Imposition* upon those that han't these Books, and want Opportunity to read them, that we should never attempt to strengthen a *Party* by such a Method that can hardly pretend to *common Honesty*, and much less to *Openness* and *Generosity*: and is besides, a very

* Inquis. into the Constit. &c. p. 38.

† Crit. Hist. &c. p. 64, 65. &c.

great Injustice to the Reputation of many that are thus treated. Whether *S. P. K.* be of *Mr. P.*'s Mind, I shall not enquire: I will venture to say, his Books are not; which is the Reason why I mention'd the Works of this truly great Man.

Mr. P. I apprehend, hath as little Reason to say in Opposition to Bishop *Burnet*, *p. 77.* that the Authors mention'd by him, don't hold the Substance of these Doctrines we contend for. I have read *Novatian* also, of whom *Mr. P.* says, that his Opinions are as contrary to the common Notion, as Light is to Darknes. And tho' I can't approve several things that are said by this Author, any more than I can a great many things that are said by others, who yet in the main are allow'd by all to be orthodox; yet he constantly asserts our Saviour to be *God*. Not a *God by Office*, but as much of the same Nature with the *Father*, as any Son of Man is with his *Father*. This appears from the Passage I quoted but now, which is out of his Book of the *Trinity*: and there also speaking on that Text on which such Strefs is laid by *Mr. P.* and others, *John xvii. 3.* he does not think "that the *Term Only* doth exclude our Saviour from being God, but that he would never have mention'd himself at all, unless he would have had it to be understood, that he also was "God." *i. e.* If there be any Meaning in his Words, God in the same *Sense* and *Acceptation* that the *Father* was. Farther in this very Book, he endeavours to prove, as modern *Catholicks* do, from our Saviour's Omnipresence, and from his being worship'd in all Places, and by all Persons, that he is God: God in such a *Sense*, as no *created*, inferior Person can be, that he and the *Father* are *consubstantial*: so I understand the Phrase, *per Substantiae Communionem* used by this Author. Farther, he calls those *Hereticks* that deny our Saviour to be God: and speaks of him as being himself that Lord God, who spake unto

unto *Agar*, *Sarah's* Maid, *Gen.* xvi. 7, 13. compar'd. And farther, that 'tis as God that our Saviour says, *I and my Father are one.* And moreover, that our Saviour is the God of *Abraham*, &c. If I laid, as I do not, any great stress upon Authorities, I might have mention'd more: but this is enough to shew, that this Author may be justly claim'd, as being on the orthodox side; and that any odd Expressions of his ought in Justice to be interpreted in Consistency with his main and general Sense: or if they can't, as I don't see but they may, he must be look'd upon as an Author that contradicts himself. His general Sense I take to be, that he was God in a strict and proper Sense: and accordingly he was never reckon'd, notwithstanding the Exceptionableness of some of his Expressions, as *Ebion*, *Cerintus*, *Samosatenus*, *Praxeas*, &c. were; as opposing the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. The great, and for ought I find, the only important thing for which he was censur'd, was his Opinion, that there was no Remission for the Lapsed; so as that they might be again receiv'd into the Bosom of the Church: This was call'd his *Heresy*; but he never deny'd the Godhead of our blessed Saviour; and therefore was never esteem'd a Heretick for opposing the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: Nay, the Divinity of our Saviour is what he doth over and over assert, and always supposeth the *Son* to be of the same Nature with the *Father*; and to be call'd the *Son* upon this Account.

As to *Tertullian*, I allow with Mr. P. that he is in some parts of his Writings obscure: But whereas Mr. P. says, "That if the dark Passages of his Writings are explain'd by those that are more clear, he is plainly and directly against those that now claim the Glory of Orthodoxy." This, in the Apprehension of *Unitarians* themselves, is a gross Mistake: and accordingly, *Tertullian* is call'd by Mr. Gilbert

Clerk

Clerk in his *Antinicensismus, Trinitarius, & Trinitariorum Pater*. And tho' it be not true what he says, that *Tertullian* was the Author of the *Nicene*, or *Athenasian* Notion of the *Trinity*; yet his Notions and theirs do so fully agree, that he is given up by this Author. And what, I beseech Mr. P. can be more clear, than what he says in his Book *De Pudicitia*, that the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, have one Divinity, or are one God? And so, what can be more express than what he says in his Book against *Praxeas*; where writing against one that confounded *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and made them no more than *three Names*: He says, there is *Una Substantia in Tribus Coherentibus*; which I take to be a full Expression of that Orthodox Faith, viz. that there are three Persons, and one Substance: or three Persons, and one God; which we are not asham'd to glory in, tho' Mr. P. be pleas'd to ridicule it. Farther, this Author says, that the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are one Substance, of one Power, one Condition, because one God: and also that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; and that each of them is God; and that together they make one God, in whom we are to believe. And what is farther observable in this Author is, that he declares, that this Doctrine came from the *Rule of Faith*, deliver'd by the Apostles before *Praxeas*, or any *Hereticks* his Predecessors. So that there is nothing, I think, in the poor Evasion that some have started, that *Tertullian* writ those things when he was a *Montanist*: For if he had deliver'd any thing as receiv'd by the Church, which the Church did not really receive; it was easy at that time for *Praxeas*, or some of his *Adherents*, to confute him, as perverting the Doctrine of the Church: But I don't find, that this was so much as pretended by his Adversaries. And as for his Performances against

Praxeas,

Praxeas, they were applauded by the Church; and 'tis, I think, chiefly from these Writings, that we are to gather what was the settled Sense of this Author.

WHAT Mr. P. says of *Ireneus*, viz. "That the Passages in him are too plain to be evaded," is true in our Sense, but not in his. For if we consult these *Credentials* of his that are extant; in one of them he says expressly, that our Saviour is our *Lord*, and *God*, and *King*. And in another, that for the great Love that he bore to Mankind, his own Workmanship, he assum'd the human Nature, and thereby united *Man* to *God*. And that he doth not mean that he was a *God* by *Office*, according to the modern Language of *Antitrinitarians*, is undeniably evident from another Passage of his; where he says, that he, together with the Father, is the *God* of the Living; who spake to *Moses*, and was manifested to the Fathers as their *God*, the *God* of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*: Nay farther, he says, that if our Saviour was not truly and properly *God*, he would never have been so call'd *definitively* and *absolutely*, either by the *Holy Ghost* or by the *Apostles*. He pleads expressly, that the Word *God*, when apply'd to the *Father*, and when apply'd to the *Son*, is to be understood in the same Sense. And farther, as he calls our Saviour the *true God*, so also he calls him the *only God*: telling us, that he, together with the Father, is justly call'd, *God* and *Lord*. So full is this Author, that he won't allow any but an eternal Being to be properly *God*: nor any one but *God* to be able to create: And yet, in an exact Conformity to the Scriptures, he ascribes the Works of Creation to our blessed Saviour: and says, that he was from all Eternity. And farther, that he manifested himself to be *God* by forgiving Sins; which he looks upon to be the peculiar Prerogative of the most high *God*. I have put the Sayings of these ancient

cient Authors into our own Language, for the sake of the *English Readers*; who have as near a Concern in this *fundamental Point* as other Persons. The Learned know that I have said nothing from them but what they speak themselves: and therefore I think we have just Right to claim them, as being on our side.

As to what Mr. P. argues, from the Synod of *Antioch's* condemning the Word *ὁμοῦσιος*, when they had the Case of *Paulus Samosatenus* before them; that the common Opinion could not have been then receiv'd: there can be nothing in this, unless that Synod had deny'd, that the Son and Holy Ghost were truly and properly God; God in the same Sense that the Father is: But this, I believe Mr. P. knows the Synod was so far from doing, that they condemn'd *Paulus* because he held our Saviour to be no more than a *meer Man*; and one that had no Existence before he was born of the *Virgin Mary*. According to him, there was but one Person, and three Names in the Godhead: And this was all he meant by that Assertion of his, that the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* were one God: He was therefore very justly censur'd by the Synod of *Antioch*; for thus endeavouring to destroy, according to *Epiphanius*, the Person and Deity of our blessed Saviour and the Holy Ghost: This evidently shews, that the Synod of *Antioch* did abhor the *Sabellian Scheme*. The *Arian* was not invented till about half a Century afterwards: and the great Indignation of the Church against it as soon as 'twas laid open, is Demonstration to me, that this was not the *ancient Orthodox Faith*. Nor can I perceive that there was any Difference at all as to Faith, between the Council of *Nice*, and the Synod of *Antioch*. The first indeed did not think fit to use the Word *ὁμοῦσιος*, because *Paulus Samosatenus* had chosen it. The Council of *Nice* thought the

Word Significant, to discriminate the *Arians* from the *Orthodox*; and therefore resum'd the Use of it: but took care to declare at the same time, that 'tis not to be understood in the same Sense, when apply'd to God, and us'd concerning Men. I can't see but these *Councils* had the same Notions, tho' they did not think fit to use the same Word. They both agree, that Christ hath the *Fulness of the Godhead* in him; that he is both God and Man: Nor doth it appear, that they had one Notion of God when apply'd to the *Father*; and another when apply'd to the *Son*: They thought both to be God, in a strict and proper Sense; that the *Son* was as much God by *Nature*, as the *Father* was.

As to what Mr. P. says, "That both *Papists* and *Protestants* have censur'd the *Ancients* for not being sound in these Points." I can easily allow *Petavius's Censure*, which is much the same with that of others: If Mr. P. will admit of his *Excuse*, viz. *Quod ab omni Culpâ liberandi sunt Patres, tametsi de Trinitate minus commodè pronunciâsse videntur, nondum agitatâ Controversiâ.* The Censure indeed, viz. that they don't speak so accurately, and advantageously of this awful Subject, as they should do; may suit the *Moderns* that are reputed *Orthodox*, as well as the *Ancients*; tho' the *Controversy* hath been canvass'd and consider'd a long time; when they run too far in their Explications of this sublime and adorable Subject. 'Tis on these Explications that Dr. Clark, Mr. Whiston, Mr. Emlyn, Mr. P. and almost all the Writers on the *Arian* and *Socinian* side, do take Advantage; tho' the *modern Orthodox*, I think, write with a great deal more *Judgment* and *Caution*, than most of the *Ancients* did. In that which is most important in this *Controversy*, the *Ancients* and *Moderns*, I think agree, viz. in asserting the true and proper *Deity* of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, in Opposition

to the Tenets of *Arians* and *Sabellians*. And in this, I humbly apprehend, the *Assembly* might be positive, without making either the *Ancients* or *Moderns* a Rule unto them: which neither was, nor could be their Design, who are such strenuous Assertors of the Authority and Sufficiency of Scripture, against all *Deists* and *Papists*, and other *Enemies* and *Corrupters* of these sacred Oracles. How far 'tis true of several of the *Subscribers*, that they deserve Mr. P's Censure, (who seldom fails to expose them when he hath an Opportunity) for being Strangers to *Antiquity*, I can't say. As to what concerns my self, I'll say in Mr. P.'s own Words, that I will not be so vain as to pretend to give a large Account of the Sayings of the Fathers upon this Head: Some of them I have read, and others not; and am not ashamed to own my self oblig'd to those *Historians* who have had better Opportunities, and have generally been look'd upon as Faithful in giving us their Sense; and on whom nothing to the contrary hath been prov'd that I have seen: But after all, I own, I build my Faith on the *Scriptures*, and not on *Fathers* and *Councils*: However, am very glad to find, that I am not forc'd to dissent from them in my Notions concerning the eternal Power and Godhead of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*.

I can't see with what Pertinency Mr. P. should mention the *Antinomian Faith*, unless to parallel ours with it. And tho' I can easily believe, that many *Antinomians* have been sav'd, because their strict and blameless Lives, have happily contradicted their loose and licentious Principles; yet this I still say, that if a Man govern himself by *Antinomian Principles*, he can't be sav'd: because I can't but take this to be inconsistent with *Repentance*, and a Life of *Holiness* and *Obedience*. And when any that call themselves *Antinomians* are humble for their Sins, and obedient to God, they quit

their *distinguishing Principles*; and so are not sav'd in that which is call'd *their Faith* or *Opinion*, but another. And if Mr. P. won't say the same, with respect to the Principles that are held by us; he says nothing. If *our Principles* have the same Tendency that the *Antinomian Principles* have, they ought to be oppos'd with the utmost Zeal: Nor can Mr. P. excuse it, that he did not oppose them sooner. If they have no such Tendency, but a happy Influence on our eternal Salvation, as we say they have; they ought not to be oppos'd at all: and much less rank'd with *Antinomian Principles*, which strike at the Foundation of the Christian Religion.

MR. P. can't deny, p. 78, 79. that there was a most agreeable *Harmony* among *Dissenters*, before the Revival of *Arianism* by Dr. Clark, Mr. Whiston, &c. why was there not a Continuance of that Harmony? Who were the Persons that fell in with these new *Schemes*; and that encourag'd the Propagation of the *Arian Notions*? By whom were the Disturbances rais'd in *Exon* and elsewhere? Who were the Persons that spread the *Pamphlets* in *City* and *Country*, that were writ in favour of this *antiquated Heresy*? Will Mr. P. pretend to palm it upon the World, that he and his Brethren were altogether passive in this Matter? Were we not too long patient under the Increase of these Opinions; suffering our selves and our Profession to be abundantly reproach'd, out of Tenderness to our Brethren; and in hope that they would return to their old Principles? Were there no Divisions before *September 1718*? By whom were these Divisions made? And with what Face can Mr. P. say, that they never interested themselves in this *Controversy*, till constrain'd thereto by an Invasion of their *Rights*? And after all, what *Rights* of Mr. P. or any other were invaded by the *Assembly*? Or what *Power* did we assume, that we ought not? Had we not as much Power

Power to declare our Faith when assembled together, as others had to ~~declare~~ theirs; Had we not as much *conceal* Power to subscribe what we believ'd, as others had to refuse Subscription? We assum'd no Power of censuring, or arraigning any Person: but declar'd in favour of that which we took to be *Truth*, and against that which we apprehended to be *Error*. And if every particular Minister hath a Right to do this; we have as much a Right to do it, when Synodically assembled, to strengthen one another's Hands; and to afford our mutual Assistance to each other, in promoting the Interest of our common Christianity.

SUCH a Power as this we must have, or we have no Power to preach against *Heresy*: to warn Persons against *Seducers*: Nor can we without such a Power take heed to the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made us Overseers; when either grievous Wolves shall enter in among them, or when any from among our selves shall arise, speaking perverse things to draw away Disciples after them. To strip us of such a Power, is in a great Measure to render our Ministry useless: a thing that the *Deists* have been attempting a long time. To act as we did, is no more than to manifest a just Concern about our own and our People's Faith: which tho' Mr. P. seems but little to regard, yet we dare not be indifferent in a Matter of such Importance. We can't be indolent, when we see it invaded, and violently run down as of old by *Celsus*, *Julian*, &c. as *Nonsense*, *Contradiction*, *Enthusiasm*, the *Jargon of the Schools*, &c. This is the great Objection that was made by *Jews* and *Heathens*, against Christianity, that our Saviour made himself God: For this the *Jews* would have ston'd him; and the *Heathens* reckon'd him an *Impostor*. And therefore, I think Mr. P. doth very odly compare us with these *Gentlemen*; when he, and some others, have espoused the

the same Quarrel, and raise the same Objections against our Saviour's Divinity, that they did. This Doctrine of his Divinity, is part of our own and our People's Faith, which we have no otherwise in our Possession, than to assist them in the Defence of it when it is attack'd: This is what we have done, and must do; and if this be to be the Authors of *Faction* and *Division*, we can't be otherwise.

If we recommend a Mistake for a true Doctrine, let Mr. P. convince us: But he is far from having an infallible Assurance that we do; and therefore it must be charg'd to others Account, and not ours, that there have been such Divisions in the Church of Christ. 'Tis known, that we stick to the *ancient Faith*, and that Mr. P. &c. are for introducing an *exploded Heresy*. To oppose this, is what we take to be our Duty: Nor have we, that I know, done the least Disservice to the Cause of *Liberty*, by what we have done. If Mr. P. or that other *admir'd Writer* for the Cause of *Liberty*, have been pleading for a *Liberty* that's destructive to *Faith* and *Discipline*; we have been under a Mistake. We thought they had been pleading against *Persecution* for *Conscience* sake; and that Men ought not to be abridg'd of their *civil Privileges*, for *their religious Notions*; whilst they don't appear to be inconsistent with the Safety of the *State*. Such a *Liberty* as this we are still zealous for. We insist upon it, as the undoubted unalienable Right of Mankind, that Persons be suffer'd to act according to their Consciences, as long as their Notions are not subversive of the *civil Government*: But very sure I am, that it hath never been a common Notion among *Dissenters*, that *Manichees*, *Ebionites*, *Arians*, *Anthropomorphites*, *Socinians*, *Papists*, abstracting from their political Notions, or if there be any other Denomination of Christians that have a worse Faith and Opinions than any of these: It hath never, I say,

say, been our Opinion, that all those should associate in one Communion with us, that are *Protestant Dissenters*: This, if I mistake not, is the *Liberty* Mr. P. now pleads for. And if we had understood, that this had been the *Liberty* that he, or any other, how considerable soever, had pleaded for formerly; instead of receiving it well, we should have abhor'd the *Scandal* of the Notion, and taken it as one of the most reproachful things that could have been said of us. I would fain know, upon what plain Scripture Mr. P. would establish that *Liberty*, that some of the worst of *Hereticks* and *Idolaters* may be admitted to Communion; and encourag'd to minister in sacred things. I think, if such are left to God and their own Consciences, 'tis all they can expect: But that every Christian Society should be under Obligations to receive such as *Ministers* or *Members*; is, I think, under the specious and plausible Name of *Liberty*, to introduce one of the worst of *Impositions*: That which must fill the Churches with *Distraction* and *Confusion*; and in a little time be attended, I fear, with the *Ruin* of all *Religion*. The *Dissenters* were never for such a *Liberty*, and I hope never will.

WHATEVER Mr. P. thinks, p. 80, I can't but take it to be undeniable, that if St. Paul thought, that our Saviour was God over all, blessed for evermore; and that if he had the same Notion of the Holy Ghost, as I can't doubt but he had; he must also think, that they, together with the Father, were the one God: unless he thought, as 'tis plain he did not, that there were three Gods over all, blessed for evermore. But I have another Reason for thinking that this was St. Paul's Notion: for that if it had not, I can't imagine that he would ever have apply'd to them for the Blessings that he doth, in that *Apostolical Benediction* before-mention'd and explain'd, viz. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. St. Paul perfectly

fectly knew, that there was but one God; and that these great Blessings were given by none but this one God; and yet he names the three Persons: which to me is a clear and full Evidence, that St. Paul did not place the *Unity* of the Godhead in one *Person*, as Mr. P. doth; but in one *Essence*, which belongs to the *sacred Three*; in whose Name the Churches are to be bless'd, as well as baptiz'd. And it deserves, I think, our Observation, that in this *Apostolical Benediction*; Christ is first mention'd: which by the way, would be strange and unaccountable, if the Apostle had thought him to be an *inferior* God; a God only by *Office* and *Deputation*. And methinks, when the Apostle doth so solemnly apply to *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, for the highest Blessings that are given to the Churches, and for Blessings that none but God can give; and directs other Ministers to do the same; 'tis Demonstration to me, that he could not look upon our Saviour and the Holy Ghost, to be *inferior, subordinate Beings*; or the Father to be the one God in Exclusion of them: For this would be to do the highest and most solemn *Service, to them that by Nature are no God*; which in *Heathens* he condemns as *Sacrilege* and *Idolatry*. The *Apostle*, who knew the Principles of natural Religion better than I, or even Mr. P. can pretend to; did think it no Contradiction to these Principles, and particularly to that, that there is but one God, to assert, concerning our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, that they are God. Nor can we think, that he understood the Term *God*, when apply'd to them in any low Sense; because he represents them as deserving the highest Acts of Worship, and as giving the highest and best Blessings: And therefore, when these are excluded from the *Unity* of God, this *Unity* must be struck at; because they are represented as sharing in the Glory, as doing the Works, and having the Perfections

Perfections of the one God. Nor is it any greater Objection against this Notion of the divine *Unity*, that we are not able to explain how three Persons can be one God; than it is, that we are not able to explain how God made the World, and continues it in Being; how he knows things to come, and is every where present at the same time. Mr. P. says, my Arguments move him not: but that I have learn'd not much to wonder at, tho' they should carry with them the clearest Evidence.

BUT Mr. P. won't allow, that they are represented as having the same glorious Perfections. "The Son and Spirit, says he, are not represented as *self-existent* and *underived*." What doth he mean by *self-existent* and *underived*? These Words, to me, don't carry any positive Perfection in them; nor do they convey any thing but negative Ideas. Nor is it true, that they are represented as deriving their *Godhead* from the Father. There is nothing in the Scripture like it, that it is owing either to the *Will*, or *Power* of the *Father*, that our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost* are God: That they derive their Being from the Father, as other created Beings do: Or that if the Father had so pleas'd, they might not have been God at all: They are all *necessarily existent*, and as to their Being, *Independent*. But farther, how is it that Mr. P. after Dr. *Clark*, doth single out *Self-existence*, which doth not seem to be a Perfection; and pass by all those that are allow'd to be so? The Reason to me is plain: Tho' they are peculiar to God; yet they are ascrib'd to our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost*. Thus they are all represented, as *Infinite*, *Eternal*, *Unchangeable*, as *Omniscient*, *Omnipresent*, &c. Now, according to any Notions that we have of things; these are Perfections of that sort, that they can't be separated from the *divine Nature*. Several of these Perfections, we discover in the Works of Creation and

Providence; and therefore strongly conclude that there is a God. By Revelation we are assur'd, that these Perfections belong to *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; and therefore we conclude after the same Manner, and if possible, with stronger Evidence, that they are God. Yea, the Inference is made for us in the Words of Scripture, where they are said to be God, as well as to have the Perfections of the *Godhead*. Farther, Mr. P. says, p. 80. "That they are not represented as doing the same Works: I mean, says he, in the same Manner." And did I ever say that they were? But 'tis sufficient, that they are all said to create and preserve, to work Miracles, to search the Hearts, and sanctify and save the Souls of Men. These Works are sufficient to distinguish them from all Beings that are not *truly and essentially* God. As to any of these awful things that do pass between those glorious Persons, how One is to act, and how the Other; this, I humbly apprehend, is nothing to the Argument. The *Argument* is, that these Works that I have mention'd, are confin'd to God, to the one living and true God; and yet done by *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: The Conclusion then, is easy and unforc'd, that they must therefore be the one God. Nor can there be but the most perfect *Harmony* between them; because they are infinitely and immutably Perfect: But how this *Harmony* can be so perfect, so immutable and sure, where there is a want of infinite Perfection, I should be glad, (seeing 'tis so easy) to see explain'd: As also Mr. P.'s Notion of *Subordination*, without *mincing* the Matter, or using *equivocal Words*; which in a Matter of such Moment as doth concern the *Faith and Salvation* of Men, should be avoided.

Mr. P. says farther, p. 81. "That I am far from having prov'd, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* have the *Stile, Title and Character* of God in the
 " sacred

“ sacred Writings; he adds, the supreme, or one
 “ God;” which he might well enough have spar’d,
 when concern’d with one that neither knows, or,
 owns any other but the *one supreme God*. Now I
 think, that the *Stile, Title and Characters* that are
 given this one supreme God are, that he is *Jeho-*
vah, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, the God
that made the Earth and Heavens, the God in whom
all Creatures live, and move, and have their Beings, &c.
 Mr. P. can’t deny, that these are the *Characters* of
 the most high God: And if he’ll be so open as to
 tell me, which of them don’t belong to *Father, Son,*
 and *Holy Ghost*, as I think the Scriptures make it e-
 vident they all do; or what higher Titles there are
 that don’t belong to our *Saviour*, and the *Holy*
Ghost; I shall fairly and impartially consider what
 he says, if not deliver’d in a way of *dogmatical Af-*
sertion, without any Support by proper Arguments;
 which is the Method he hath thought fit to take
 in the Performance I am considering: Of this we
 have a remarkable Instance in what follows, p. 81.

“ I own, that when the *Apostle* asserts, *that to us*
 “ *there is but one God the Father*, he excludes all
 “ other Beings, or Persons from the Unity of God.”
 This, I confess, is a plain and bold Assertion, that
 neither our *Saviour* or the *Holy Ghost* are God: But
 how doth it appear that they are excluded from
 the Godhead by this Text? ’Tis evident to any one,
 that the *Apostle’s* Design in this Chapter, is to ex-
 pose the Vanity of the *Heathen Idols*; and to dissuade
 Christians from paying them any real or seeming
 Honour. To this Purpose he tells them, that *Idols*
are nothing in the World. They are so far from hav-
 ing that true *Divinity*; and deserving that solemn
 Homage and Worship that were paid them, that
 the *Apostle* tells them upon the same Argument in
 another Chapter, viz. Chap. x. 20. *that the things*
which the Gentiles sacrific’d, they sacrific’d to Devils;

and not to God: They were *evil Spirits* that promoted their idolatrous Worship; and were the *Objects* and *Directors* thereof: And therefore, he would not that they should at all countenance a Worship so abominable in it self, and so offensive to Heaven, Nor would he, that they should be so foolish as to worship those that were no better than *nominal Gods*. Thus the *Apostle* doth condemn at once all the *Heathen Gods*, and all other *Votaries*. He would not that Christians should have any Fellowship with them; repair to their Temples, and partake of their Sacrifices; and especially when they profess'd to be the *Worshippers* of the one God: the *Father of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him*: By which Characters the *Apostle* doth distinguish, not only the *Father*, but our *blessed Saviour*, from all *nominal, titular Gods*; that had neither Knowledge to know the Necessities; nor yet Power to supply the Wants of such as apply'd to them.

MR. P. out of his abundant Regard to our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost*, won't say as he doth of the *Heathen Idols*, that they have nothing of the *Divinity* belonging to them, that their *Worshippers* fancied. No, "This, says he, p. 81. would be very injurious to the Son and Spirit; since it is by them that the one God works, and dispenseth Benefits to Men: And therefore I would answer this, just as I suppose Bishop Burnet, and perhaps Mr. Enty would, a Person that should ask, whether the Cloud that the *Israelites* worship'd, was the supreme God, or an Idol." What mean and disparaging Thoughts must Mr. P. have of our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost*; when, according to him, they are no other to the supreme God, (as the Expression seems to import) than the *Cloud* among the *Israelites* was: And that as to their *Divinity*, they are pretty much the same that the *Heathen*
then

then Idols were; excepting, that the great God is pleas'd to dispense his Benefits by them. For tho' this doth raise them a little higher as to their *Divinity*, than the Heathen Idols; yet it doth not advance them above *Angels*: for that God is pleas'd to use these as *Instruments* of his Providence. *They are ministring Spirits, sent forth to minister to them that shall be Heirs of Salvation*: and yet, notwithstanding all the Divinity that they have, we justly reckon it Idolatry in the Papists, to pay them Worship. And so disparaging it is to our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier*, to be spoken of as they are here by Mr. P. that I wish he may be able to excuse his Expressions from *Blasphemy*. The *Apostle*, I think, in this Passage, hath sufficiently guarded against such mean Apprehensions of our blessed Saviour: He is not one of Mr. Mede's *inferior Deities*, resembling the *Baalim* among the *Heathens*: He is not one of Mr. P.'s *subordinate Lords*; who hath the *Name*, without the *Nature* of the true God. I think one of the *Antenicene Fathers* gives a much better Account of this Text, than either Mr. P. or Mr. Mede. I wonder, says he, that some (who read that there is but one God the Father; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things) should deny; that we ought to profess the Son of God, to be God, for fear we should say there are two Gods: But those that think so, don't consider, that as the *Apostle* doth not speak of our Lord Jesus Christ's being the one Lord, as to have us conclude from thence, that God the Father is not Lord: So neither doth he speak of the Father's being the one God, as to have it believ'd from thence, that the Son is not God. Yea, from the Title that the *Apostle* gives our Saviour, and the Design of the Chapter, 'tis clear to me, that these *Ancients* understood the *Apostle* right; who said, *Quod in Dominatione Deitas, & in Deitate Dominatio*.

To shew, that there is no ground here for Mr. Mede's Distinction of Superiour, and Inferiour Deity, or Mr. P.'s Supreme God, and Subordinate Lord; 'tis observable, that the Apostle says here the very same thing of the Father, that he elsewhere doth of our Saviour: And the same thing of our Saviour, that he elsewhere doth of the Father. Of the Father he says here, *that all things are his* ἑαυτοῦ, or *for him*: of the Son he useth the same Phrase, *Col. i. 16.* of the Son he saith here, *that all things are by him* δι' αὐτοῦ, or *by him*: of the Father he gives exactly the same Description, *Heb. ii. 10.* which evidently shews, that neither the one God, nor the one Lord, are to be taken in the *exclusive Sense*: But he that is the one God, is also the one Lord: And he that is the one Lord, is also the one God. And this promiscuous Use of the Titles *God* and *Lord*, and other Characters, is common in Scripture. Thus, as the *Father* is said to be *Lord of Heaven and Earth*, so the *Son* is said to be *God over all*, the *God* which made the Heavens and Earth, of which the *Father* is *Lord*. And to shew that these are not exclusive, and appropriated Phrases; as they relate to the *Father*, and *Son*, (tho' they are as relating to the one living and true God) 'tis said of the *Father*, that he made all things, and of our *Saviour* that he is *Lord of all*. They are also both said to be *King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*. Of both it is said, that they are *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *first* and the *last*, &c. And when what is here said of the *Father* and *Son* is true also of the *Holy Ghost*, viz. that he is *God*, and *Lord*; I think, it is infinitely derogatory to the *Son* and *Spirit* to speak of them as Mr. P. doth. And what can possibly be so, if it be not to deny them their *Godhead*? This is to sink them into nothing and *Vanity*, if they are compar'd with the one *God*; and in Effect to deny them all *Love* and

Obedience, but what is due to created Beings. And when the plainest Expressions of Scripture are so very full against these Notions, I think, 'tis a very poor Reason to take them up, that we are not able fully to comprehend the *common Notion*: and because the Scriptures speak of the Father's sending the *Son*, and the Son's sending the *Holy Ghost*. For as to the thing's being above our Comprehension in some things, will Mr. P. pretend to say, that there are not many incomprehensible things both in the *Arian*, and *Socinian Scheme*? Let him but chuse his *Scheme*, and stick to it; and I shan't much doubt to make it evident that it is so. And then, as to the Father's sending the Son, and the Son's sending the Comforter, this is perfectly consistent with an *Equality* of Nature among Men: nor doth it necessarily import *Authority*, and *Superiority*. Nor can I see, that there is need of more to account for this, as it relates to God, than a *mutual Consent* between the Divine Persons. As to our Saviour 'tis plain, that as he promis'd to send the Holy Ghost; so He was sent by the Holy Ghost, as he himself declares, *Luke iv. 18. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, preach Deliverance to the Captives, &c.* Whatever Mr. P.'s Notion be, he won't say, I suppose, that the Son is subordinate to the Spirit. And as being sent doth not import *Subordination*; so *Sameness of Essence*, I don't take to be inconsistent with a *Plurality of Persons*; nor consequently with the sending Mr. P. speaks of. If I can't have comprehensive Ideas of this; so neither can Mr. P. any more than I of the Divine *Eternity*, *Omniscience*, and *Omnipresence*: But should either He or I reject every thing, where an infinite Nature is concern'd, that we are not able fully to comprehend;

we

we must soon run not only into *Scepticism*, but *Atheism* too. I think it a sufficient Foundation to build upon, that *Natural Religion* assures me that there is a God, and but one : and that I have it declar'd by Revelation who this One God is, *viz* *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* : to each of whom, both the *Name* and *Perfections* of the most High God are often attributed.

NOR is it any Confutation hereof, that the Head of Christ is God. I allow to Mr. P. that this is true, if we consider Christ as Man : But he is pleas'd to say, p. 83. " That the Apostle commendeth both Natures as far as he apprehends." But must I always take Mr. P.'s Apprehensions for a Proof that it is so ? To convince me, he should have offer'd his Reasons : For otherwise, I may as well expect, that my Apprehensions should govern him, as he that his should govern me : and yet should I allow Mr. P.'s Apprehensions ; 'twould no more prove an *Inequality* of Nature, than it doth, that there is such an *Inequality* between a Man and Woman ; because in the same Place, the Man is said to be the Head of the Woman, 1 Cor. ii. 3. And I might the more easily allow it too ; because Christ is said, to be the Head of all *Principality and Power* ; and that, as he hath the *Fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in him*, Col. ii. 9, 10 : But I don't see, that there is the least Reason for going off from my former Interpretation. And as little reason do I see, why we should give up that glorious Passage, Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8. of which the most Learned Bishop Bull says, that if it be rightly consider'd, 'tis enough to overturn all the *Heresies* that are vented against our *Blessed Saviour*. And whom doth Mr. P. mean, when he says, " that so many of the most learned Men of our Side have given it up as not to the Purpose ?" For not to take Notice of the

Writings

Writings among *Dissenters*, who, as far as I have seen and remember, are unanimous for the Text: Do not A. B. Tillotson, Bishop Burnet, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Waterland, Dr. Scot, Dr. Barrow, &c. insist upon it as a clear and irrefragable Proof of our Saviour's *Divinity*? And what if I should say as Dr. Clark, &c. do, (which yet I see no Necessity of; but that our Translation may be justified) that our Saviour did *not* *covet* to be honour'd as God? was not greedy, or fond of, or unwilling to let go the Price of being honour'd as God? yet this, I think, will prove nothing, but that our Saviour was infinitely condescending: that he did not affect this *Honour* in the time of his *Humiliation*, tho' he was in the *Form of God*; and did deserve it upon that Account: If he did not affect this; If he did not make an *Offentation*, or rather a *glorious Display* of his transcendent Excellencies; 'tis what, it seems; he might have done, if he had not way'd his own Honour for a time: and for our sakes consented to come, *not to be ministred unto, but to minister; and to give his Life a Ransom for many*. 'Tis amazing; that our Saviour did not affect to appear as he was: that when he had the *Form of God*, and was really God, and had no *Superior*, he should yet appear in the *Form of a Servant*: So that, let the Phrase $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ be taken according to our Translation, or Dr. Clark's; yet the whole Passage invincibly proves what 'tis brought for: And therefore, 'tis unreasonable to call us *Persecutors, Imposers, Creed-makers*, &c. that we thus interpret this, and other Passages of Scripture. If Mr. P. and others are not pleas'd with our Interpretations, they are at their Liberty: But then, 'tis just that we should also be at ours; and not be oblig'd to encourage those, that we think do pervert the Scriptures in so important an Article. What Mr. P. says, p. 82, 83. "of making Creeds, and

“imposing them with Rigour,” is nothing to us: and therefore, 'tis very unjust to heap up opprobrious Expressions; and bring them to bear upon us, when we don't deserve them. The *Apostle's* Words we have the highest Veneration for: But when they are us'd as a *Shelter* for all sorts of Errors; then 'tis a proper Time to express the Sense of them, and to govern our selves in our *ministerial Acts*, according to the best Judgment we can make of things; and to leave others to God, and their own *Consciences*, who can't acquiesce in our Sentiments: This is the *noble Liberty* of *Protestant Dissenters*, that we have been contending for, and are contented with: This *Liberty* we never have, and I hope shall never break in upon.

MR. P. is at Liberty to censure us as merciless Men, for mentioning the Danger of that *Infidelity*, that we think he and some of his Brethren are fallen into. The *Jews* thought the same of our Saviour himself; and so do others of Mr. P. as well as us, for declaring to them the Will of God, in Instances that are hardly disputed among sober Christians: This is all we do, (tho' Mr. P. calls it making Terms of Salvation) and are nearly concern'd that we have any Occasion. And if we are mistaken in representing the Danger of *Arianism*, and other *Errors*; we are not wilfully, or carelessly mistaken: Nor do we think our selves so wise, as not to be willing to hearken to what is said: We take this to be a part of the *Counsel of God*, that we are to declare, that our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost* are GOD: And that to believe this, where the Gospel is preach'd, is so necessary and indispensable, that Persons can't disbelieve it, without the utmost Danger: Thus much we declare; and if we did not, we could not be faithful to the Trust repos'd in us: of such extraordinary Moment do we take it to be.

Mr. P. says, p. 83. "That I know he believes all the high and great things that are said of the Son and Holy Ghost in Scripture:" I assure him, I think he does not. He may believe perhaps, that such and such Passages in holy Writ, relate to our Saviour and the Holy Ghost: And also, that these Scriptures were given by Inspiration of God: But if the Holy Ghost, who is that God that inspir'd these Writings, did intend to signify by these Passages, that he himself, and our Saviour are really GOD; and Mr. P. takes them to signify no more, than that our Saviour is a Creature, and the Holy Ghost a Creature inferior to him; he can't, with any Propriety, be said to believe all the high and great things that are said of them: He believes such and such Words, or Sounds; which, considering the Subject to which they relate, are nothing without their Sense and Signification. Can a Man be said to believe all the high and great things that are said of the Perfections of the divine Nature; that believes him to have bodily Parts and Passions? Or can a Man be said to believe all the high and great things that are said of the divine Purity; and yet, believe him at the same time to be the Author of Sin? I think he can't, tho' there be many Expressions that seem to give Occasion for such Apprehensions. I think a Man may be a *Reprobate concerning the Faith*, and yet not renounce the Words of Scripture: And this is what I can't help thinking, of those who deny the Divinity of our Saviour and the Holy Ghost. I easily allow I am Fallible; and therefore am not for incurring the *threadbare Charge* of making *Tests* for other Men. I have also Charity for all Mankind: But my Charity won't therefore allow me to think, but that *Heathens, Mahometans, Jews, Papists, &c.* are in very great Danger: The same I think of *Arians* and *Socinians*. And where, I beseech Mr. P. doth Charity require,

that if Men fall into Errors; they mayn't be discourag'd, or even censur'd for them? And if this be to render Men odious and useless for the sake of their Opinions, 'tis what we take to be our Duty and Honour: We differ indeed as much from them, as they from us. And if we may judge what would have been done, if they were the greater Number, from what hath been done, tho' they are much the smaller Number; we must have been overwhelm'd with that *Torrent of Railery, Scorn, Contempt and Defamation* that hath been let out upon us by some of this smaller Number, and their *Adherents*. And what hath all this been for, but only for defending the Principles of our Religion; and taking care that they might be transmitted safe as we receiv'd them, to the rising Generation; and if possible to latest Posterity?

If our Principles should not be sound, we can't but think them to be so, and must govern our selves by our own Apprehensions. And whatever others may do, I wish Mr. P. may be able to approve his *Honesty* and *Humility* too, in discovering and embracing the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*. God forbid I should judge him, or any Man: If his own Heart doth not condemn him, neither shall I: but leave him to him who *searcheth the Heart and Reins, and will render to all according to their Works*, and will not forget to take Notice, (I speak it with the utmost Concern and Pity) of all the hard and dishonourable Speeches, that have been spoken against himself. As to any Satisfaction that we expect, 'tis no more than might be express'd in the Words of Revelation. And accordingly we could, and can still be satisfied with a due Explication of the *baptismal Form*, or the *Apostolical Benediction*, which have been spoken to, or with the first of *John*, *Rom. ix. v.* *Heb. i. 8.* *Acts v. beginning.* *1 Cor. xii. 6, 11.* These, as well as a multitude of other

Scriptures,

Scriptures, are sufficiently expressive of our Doctrine, and sufficiently reconcilable with those, that speak of the *Unity* of God. When we see with what *Force* and *Violence* these and other Texts are treated, no one can blame us, that we expected the Sense of them from others; when we lay under a common Reproach of having rejected the Doctrine of the Trinity: Or if we could not obtain this, that we should declare to the World the Doctrine that we think is contain'd in them, *viz.* that our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost* are with the *Father*, tho' not in the *Sabellian Sense*, the one *supreme God*: And yet, we are not ashamed to own, that the Manner of this is above our Apprehension. And whereas Mr. P. is desirous to know, where the Scripture makes the *Unity* of the three Persons a *Mystery*? I answer, in all these Passages where it speaks of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as the living and true God; when yet it so fully and expressly declares, that there is but one God. There is no need that the Scriptures, which were writ for Men that had their Reason about them, should declare in so many Words, that this is a *Mystery*. Our own Reason tells us, that this is one of the great things of God, that we *can't find out unto Perfection*: which is all that we mean, when we speak of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as mysterious. We can't understand this so well, and clearly, as we do some other things that are said of God. And there are some other things which Mr. P. must allow to be true and necessary also to be believ'd; which we can no more understand than this: which, tho' they mayn't in so many Words be call'd *Mysteries*; yet are really so.

MR. P. is much mistaken in saying as he does, p. 85. "That I was exceedingly out of Temper by what he says of the word *Subsistence*." There is nothing, I am sure, that looks like Anger in any
of

of my Expressions. I had reason to wonder at Mr. P.'s moving, pathetical Language about a word that we lay no stress upon. He would have thought it, 'tis likely, very ridiculous in me, had I made such a Noise about nothing; and put on such a peculiar Air of Solemnity about a poor Word that nothing is built upon. Let the word be something or nothing, Mr. P. is mistaken in saying, that 'tis brought into any Matter of Faith by us. 'Tis not in any one of the Propositions concerning the *Trinity*, that are mention'd by us; and therefore, I am still of Opinion, that it won't be thought an Evidence of the best Temper to be so much transported without any Provocation.

Mr. P. thinks it impossible, p. 85. to be prov'd from Scripture, "That the three Persons are each God in the highest Sense." To which I say, and in answer to the third of the twenty Propositions, which is exactly agreeable hereto, That if the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are not God in the highest Sense, they are not God in any proper Sense at all: in any Sense but that, in which created, finite, dependent Beings may be said to be God. And are those no more than *Creatures* by whom the World, and the things in it are and were created, upheld, and govern'd: and by whom Sinners are redeem'd, sanctified, and saved? These are things, I apprehend, that do most manifestly declare their eternal Godhead, Power, and other Perfections. By some of these we have, I think, invincibly prov'd against *Atheists*, that there is a God. And if the Works of Creation are sufficient to prove against *Atheists* that there is a God, or a Being infinitely superior to *Creatures*; why should they not prove against *Arians*, *Socinians*, and *Macedonians*, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are God; when these same Works are ascrib'd to them? These Arguments we must allow to be inconclusive against *Atheists*: or they will as strongly conclude
against

against those that deny the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, and the Holy Spirit: The Creator of the Universe, &c. being the *distinguishing Characters* of the most High God. And tho' I readily allow that this Term God in its highest Sense, is often in Scripture apply'd to the Father; yet I deny that it is ever apply'd so as to exclude the Son and Spirit. The Passage in the xviith of *John*, which is most insisted on, will no more prove it, than it will prove that the Father doth not know himself; because it is said, *Matth. xi. 27. That no one knoweth the Father but the Son:* or than it will prove, that neither the Father or Son do know the things of God; because 'tis said, *1 Cor. ii. 11. That the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God.* This latter Passage doth not exclude the Father, or Son: nor the Former the Father and Spirit: Nor doth that in *John* any more exclude the Son and Holy Spirit. When we meet with such Passages, we are to understand them so as to make them consistent with other Scriptures. The Terms $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\iota\mu\eta$, are exclusive as well as $\mu\omicron\nu$; and yet for all that, 'twou'd be blasphemous to exclude either the Father, or Holy Ghost, by that Passage. *Rev. xix. 12.* where speaking of our Saviour, 'tis said, *That he had a Name written that no one understood but himself,* $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\mu\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

WE are to lay no greater stress upon *exclusive Terms* than the Scriptures do. When such are us'd of the Son in Matters that without *Blasphemy*, or *Absurdity* must concern the Father too, we are not so to appropriate them to the Son, as to exclude the Father. And so, when such are us'd of the Father, that can't without the like *Blasphemy* and *Absurdity*, and a manifest Inconsistency with other Scriptures exclude the Son, we must interpret them so, as to take in both: or so, as not to exclude him; but such Beings as are intended to be excluded

excluded hereby, as *false Gods*, and *false Mediators*: with which the World, and particularly the *Roman Empire*, to which *Judea* was become tributary, was plentifully stock'd in our Saviour's Time. When the thing was thus in *Fact*, and *This* was one great thing that our Saviour's Religion was level'd against; 'tis no wonder that He should speak of the *God of Israel*; as the *only true God*, and of *Christ the Mediator between God and Men*, as the *only true Mediator*: This is striking at the Foundation of the *Heathen Religion*; but not destroying the Doctrine of the Trinity, which was sufficiently secur'd in other Places of Scripture. I don't know, that the Term *God*, when applied to the *Father*, hath any higher Sense, than it hath in the Passage that I have mention'd. And if we look into the 4th verse of *Jude's Epistle*, and *1 Cor. xii. 6.* it hath, I think, full as high a Sense when apply'd to the *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. And this, as *Mr. P.*'s Phrase is, is directly deliver'd in Scripture; and yet because others don't understand it as I do, I am not for imposing it. I leave such where, I think, they ought to be left, to their own Consciences: only reserving to my self a liberty of judging, and speaking of their Opinions as I think they deserve: and keeping my own Conscience from Prostitution, when they expect my Concurrence, that they should officiate in the Church of Christ.

As to what I mention'd of the Notion of some, who hold that there are *three Natures* in Christ: *Mr. P.* must observe, that I neither deliver it as my own Notion, nor lay any thing like a *stress* upon it. If I say, that such a Notion may perhaps solve some Difficulties; it is with respect to those, who from the sound of the Words may be led to think as *Mr. P.* doth, that the Father's sending the Son is an Act of *Authority*, grounded upon

upon a *Superiority of Nature*: But this is what I don't take it to be; nor any Sign of *Inferiority*: but that it may be, as we often find it is, where there is a perfect *Equality* as to *Nature*, and *Perfections*. Mr. P. says, "there is no Difficulty in his Scheme, that needs the Help of any Unscriptural Fancy." On the contrary, I think, that the Scheme it self is all over an *Unscriptural Fancy*. And as to the Difficulties that attend it, if he means only this Part of his Scheme, I easily allow, that there is no Difficulty in conceiving, that the Great God should send the most *exalted Creature* into this World. Such a created Being though never so high, is nothing at all if compar'd with God: But *This* which I take to be the Chief Part of Mr. P.'s Scheme, is, as I said, in it self an odd and *unscriptural Fancy*. For 'tis in effect to assert, that the Creator of all things is Himself a Creature. That He who upholds all things by the Word of his Power, is Himself upheld by a Superior Being. That he who knows all things, hath a limited Understanding. That a finite Being, hath infinite Perfections. And that one who hath the Worship, Powers, and Prerogatives of God, is not God. These I think are Fancies odd enough; and such, I apprehend, as Philosophy can't support, and Scripture doth condemn. And if these be not enough, there are still a great many more behind.

But Mr. P. is pleas'd to ask, p. 86. "if Christ was supreme God, how it was possible for him to be without the Glory which essentially belong'd to him?" I answer, that in Mr. P.'s Sense, He was never without the Glory which essentially belong'd to him. *The Fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in him* whilst he was on Earth, and is said to have emptied himself; and when he did not display that Majesty, and those Perfections of which he was possess'd. The

Apostle therefore to me seems plainly to place Christ's emptying himself in *This*; that he *who was in the Form of God*, did take upon him the *Form of a Servant*. That He *who was God over all*, did not appear in the *Magnificence of God*, but was *made in the Likeness of Man*. When a Person doth not appear like himself; when he doth not make a Display of that Glory, and those Perfections that are proper and peculiar to himself; he may properly enough, according to our imperfect way of speaking, be said to *empty himself*; just as He, *who is high above all Nations*, and *whose Glory is above the Heavens*, is said to *humble Himself to behold the things, that are in Heaven, and in the Earth*. When God tabernacled in *Flesh*, his *Flesh* was a *Vail* to his *Glory*: and so, when *the Word was made Flesh*, and dwelt among us, there were some that beheld his *Glory*, the *Glory as of the only begotten of the Father full of Grace and Truth*. And yet, what they beheld in his *Person*, and *Miracles*, were only some of the fainter Rays of his *Glory*. So that, though in him were hid all the *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*; yet his Appearance was so mean, that comparatively, he had *no Form, nor Comeliness, nor any Beauty that Men should desire him*. And this may satisfy Mr. P. that Christ's emptying himself, doth not hinder him from being the supreme God: and that what is said of our *Saviour's* emptying himself, can't be said of the *Father*, and the *Holy Ghost*: who tho' related to us, as our *Father*, and *Sanctifier*; yet did not assume the *Humane Nature*, and so did not suffer their *Glory* to be veil'd for us, as our *Saviour* did.

WHATEVER Clamour hath been rais'd by Mr. P. and others, and is repeated, p. 87. against an *imposing Spirit*, 'tis as to the Assembly without all Cause and Foundation. We are not gone
off

off in the least from our *old Principles*. When we have formerly pleaded most earnestly against *Impositions*, we han't been thought inconsistent, for keeping such from the *Ministry*, and *Sacraments* among ourselves, that deny'd the *Trinity*, or any other great and Fundamental Point of our Holy Religion. And what Injustice is it to any Man, when he proves himself to be an *Arian*, or *Soci-nian*, and perhaps glories in it too; to say of such a one that he is what he is, and what he counts it his *Honour* to be? And whereas Mr. P. says upon this Occasion, p. 87. "That 'tis plain we han't the same Veneration for the Words of the Holy Ghost that they have." I answer, that if he and his Brethren had such a mighty Veneration for the Words of the *Holy Ghost*, 'tis much they should take them in any Sense in which it is possible for them to be true; and not in the most *natural*, and *obvious Sense*: This is not to treat them as a *Rule of Faith*, but as a *Nose of Wax*: Not as Words given by *Inspiration of God*; but as Words thrown together by crafty Men: and of such an ambiguous Meaning, as that they might be us'd to serve any *Cause*, and support any *Hypothesis*. I don't say, that 'tis impossible that the Assembly should wrest the Words of Scripture: But if our Sense of them was not the most natural, and obvious; 'tis much that the Generality of Christians, and those that differ so much in other Matters, should so easily agree in this. And especially 'tis very strange, that our *First Reformers* both abroad and here, when they were so strictly enquiring into these *Abuses* that were crept into Religion, should perceive none at all in this *Article*. This they left as they found it, too clear in Scripture to be contradicted; and too awful in it self to be new modell'd; except by Persons of the *Sceptical*, and *daring Genius* of the present Age. And whereas

Mr. P. is every now and then flurting at us, as if we had overthrown the Foundation of the *Reformation*: Let him shew if he can, wherein we have done it a Thousandth Part of the Prejudice that they have, by their Endeavours to establish *Creature-Worship*; and using all the little *Popish Distinctions* that have been so often baffled to this Purpose. And what a fine Pass is the Reformation brought to, if we mayn't venture to call any thing Error, nor to check the Progress of what we take to be so?

I can't possibly see how either Christianity, or the Reformation can be safe; if we han't a Right to fix at least for our selves (which is all we claim) what we take to be the true Sense of Scripture. How can the Scriptures be a *Rule* to us, unless it be thus? And when we have thus fix'd upon that which we take to be the true Sense, we can't but govern our selves thereby. And if we should not act thus in all that relates to the Ministerial Office, we should despise, what in our Apprehensions is the Authority of Christ himself; who as he hath given us a *Rule*, so we are not to take it as a *Rule*, without any Sense and Meaning; but as a *Rule* to regulate our *Faith*, and *Practice*; which without fixing some Sense thereto, we could not. And whereas Mr. P. says, "that 'tis his Grief that an Assembly of Dissenting Ministers should do any thing so serviceable to the Cause of Popery." We are no doubt oblig'd to him for his Concern: But I would willingly know, if there had been an *Itch* after *Popery*, as there was after *Arianism*; what way Mr. P. would have taken to keep it out? For ought I perceive, his way to keep out *Popery*, would have been to admit Papists to Communion; to officiate as Ministers in the Church; to spread their Idolatrous Notions quietly and without all Opposition: He would have kept it out

out, by giving it the utmost Encouragement, and letting it in like a *Flood* upon us. And if any other thing, as bad or worse than *Papery* had started up, as *Marcionitism*, *Manicheism*, or as in the present Case, what we take to be *Idolatry* and *Blasphemy*; We must have given the *Abettors* of these monstrous Notions the *right Hand of Fellowship*, or sap'd the Foundation of the *Reformation*: what is this but to expose the *Reformation*; and make it to be as *Mystery Babylon*, the infamous *Mother* of all *Harlots*, and the greatest *Abomination of the whole Earth*?

MR. P. may value himself, as p. 88. that he writes for *Christian Liberty*. On the other Hand, I can see nothing, but that he writes for a most dangerous *Licentiousness*: For a most stupid *Indolency* in Ministers and People, whilst the great Adversary is sowing his Tares. For without determining whether *Arianism* be a fatal *Heresy* or no, if what he says have any thing in it, 'twill serve the Cause of any Notion; tho' more dishonourable, if possible, to our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier*, than this. According to Mr. P.'s way of arguing, 'twas a truly noble Spirit of *Liberty* in the Churches of *Thyatira*, and *Pergamus*, to suffer the *Woman Jezebel*, who call'd herself a *Prophetess*, to teach, and to seduce *Christ's* Servants to commit *Fornication*; and to eat things offer'd in sacrifice to *Idols*; and to let those alone, who held the Doctrine of *Balaam* and the *Nicolaitans*. And 'twas a little narrow *Antichristian* Spirit in *Ephesus*, not to bear those that were evil, and to try those that said they were *Apostles*, and were not. 'Twould have better become them to have minded their own Business; to have treated those false *Apostles* as Brethren; and suffer'd them to go on poisoning and perverting the Souls of Men: And if these be some of the honest *Methods* of Mr. P.'s *Racovian Friends*, may they ever be singular in this their *Honesty*: May the great Doctrines

Doctrines of Christianity have better *Patrons* than those Men. For my own part, I abhor the *Racovian Liberty* Mr. P. pleads for; and that *Spirit of Persecution* that is in *Popery*. There is a happy *Medium*, I think, that many *Churchmen* and *Dissenters* have hit upon: and that is, to discourage, as the *Assembly* have, what they take to be *Error*; and to shew themselves *Enemies to Persecution* for Conscience sake. And this is what I shall ever encourage in my Friends at *Exon*: who, as far as I can perceive, are very remote from a *Spirit of Persecution*. Mr. P. is too sensible of the *Cunning*, and *Serviceableness* of this Charge to let it go: tho' he must know, one would think, that the *Clamours* of an *implicite Faith*, of a *Popish Inquisition*, and *Persecution*, are empty and groundless. I believe, I have said enough to disarm these *Calumnies*; and therefore suppose, shall excuse my self from regarding all farther *Repetitions* of this Charge.

FOR my part, I know of no *Injustice* that's done to Mr. P. or others: If they are abandon'd, 'tis by those that could not think themselves any longer safe under their *ministerial Conduct*: By those that could not be gratified with such *Doctrine*, *Worship* and *Discipline*, as they thought most agreeable to the Word of God; and such as the *Necessities* of their Souls, and the *Honour of God* requir'd. And this is no more than asserting that *Liberty* that *Dissenters* have always claim'd, as the *unalienable Privilege of Christians*. Nor do they think it necessary to give any other Reason, if they withdraw from those that differ in *Doctrine*, abundantly less from us than Mr. P. doth; I mean those of the *establisht Church*; than that they can't in Conscience any longer join with them: This was the Case in *Exeter*, &c. And if there was some in *London* that did condemn this, when they were not so well appriz'd

appriz'd how things stood, there were many others, it seems, who were better inform'd, that did not. And what *Sentiments* the Generality of the *London Ministers* have now of Mr. P. and his *Principles*, may be gather'd very much from their late *Carriage*, when he was at *London*: where very few, I am told, did desire that he should preach in their *Pulpits*: and this, I am inform'd, out of *Disregard* to his *Notions* and *Conduct*. They have done the very same, if I am not misinform'd, that we have shewn; that they can't in Conscience encourage the Ministry of one, that hath abandon'd some of the most *important Principles* of our common Christianity. And if they had known Mr. P. so well before as they do now, and we had Reason to think we did here; they would, I can't doubt, have had the same *Sentiments* sooner than they have since. And this is not the only Instance wherein they have shewn their Dislike of Mr. P.'s *Principles*: They have done it in a *Case of Importance*, that lay before their *Fund*. And when they shall find how artfully they are spoken of by Mr. P. and misrepresented by others, as being in their *Notions*; I would humbly hope, that they'll farther do the *Truth*, and *themselves Justice* in some such *publick Manner*, as shall effectually convince an abus'd World, that they have not quitted their *old Principles*; or think favourably of those that are sprung up among us. I can't help thinking, but that as they are able to do this, so this would be one of the most signal Services that they could do for *Religion*, *Themselves* and *Posterity*, at such a Time as this. They have a glorious *Pattern* for this, *Acts xv.* and a noble *Precedent* for it among our selves; and such as did produce very happy *Effects* in the beginning of a Book in all their Hands, viz. *Gospel Truth stated and vindicated*, by Mr. afterwards Dr. *Daniel Williams*. To say nothing of those of them that

are yet living; the *Expedient*, that I presume to mind them of, was thought advisable by Persons of the best Character among us; and the *Success* of it appear'd to be of vast *Consequence* to the Churches of Christ at that time.

'Tis very strange what Mr. P. offers, p. 90. "That Ignorance should be with us as the Mother of Devotion;" when upon all Occasions, we so earnestly urge Persons to value, search and study the Scriptures: These we take to be a full and perfect *Rule of Faith and Manners*." And where's the Crime of it, if for the better Understanding of them, we had advis'd to some Books, rather than others; Must all be ignorant, tho' they have their *Bibles*, that don't read every *Arian* and *Socinian* Pamphlet? Are these the only *Performances* that can convey Light? Do we by advising Persons to watch against, and stedfastly to withstand all such *Persons, Books and Doctrines*, as have a Tendency to unsettle their Faith in the true and proper *Divinity* of the Son of God, and of the *Holy Spirit*, as *one God* with the *Father*, (which is all that we say upon this Head, and does not amount to what Mr. P. suggests) *take away* from Persons the *Key of Knowledge*? Must Persons necessarily be ignorant, if they don't read every thing, that every *cunning, confident, daring Writer* says; and many times, not without a great Mixture of *Rudeness* and *Blasphemy*, against these *Principles* of Christianity, which he thinks are taught in his *Bible*? If Christians deal with such things, they should, I think, according to our Advice, do it with Caution. As long as Persons have their *Bibles*, and study them well, there is no great Fear of Ignorance, tho' they are not conversant with every *heretical Pamphlet*. I can't think so dishonourably of the reform'd Part of *Christendom*, as to say, that Ignorance was with it the Mother of Devotion, till these *new reforming Lights*

Lights sprang up among us. We had, for ought I see, as much Light, tho' less *Boldness* and *Confidence*, before, as we have now. The great thing that we are furnish'd with, by those *Monopolizers* of Sense and true Reasoning, are *old Errors* in a *new Dress*.

Mr. P. complains, p. 91. "That his Books have been neglected by me and others." I must leave others to speak for themselves; declaring only, that I can observe no such Neglect as he speaks of: But assure him for my self, that I am not guilty of any wilful Neglect. 'Tis my Unhappiness, and not my Fault, if my Performance wants the solid Argument and Reasoning that are in his. I can't forgive my self to trifle wilfully in Matters of such Importance: And if I have, 'tis not for want of a good Inclination, but a better Ability. I have us'd no Art, I am sure, whatever Mr. P. may insinuate, but what is honest: No Cunning, but what is innocent: And as I have no Occasion to misrepresent any thing; so I can't be sensible that I have. I was appriz'd before I began my Performance, that Mr. P. would deal by me as he hath by others. And if it be no Difficulty to himself, 'tis none to me to forgive his disdainful Treatment. Mr. P. was very much mistaken in supposing, I expected any such Complement from him, as he hath from me: For if I had not known my self so well, as to know that I did not deserve to be thus complemented; yet I know Mr. P. too well to suppose, that he should decline the Complement himself, or discover any extraordinary Civility towards me. I assure Mr. P. that I think of my self in this Respect, just as he doth, viz. That many of my Brethren have Learning, and Abilities superior to mine; which I am so far from envying them the Praise of, that I heartily bless God for it, and rejoyce in it with great Sincerity. By the Grace of God I am what I am:

And seeing I have no more, 'tis a Pleasure to me to be even little among those that are better furnish'd for the Work of the Ministry. I admire the Giver, and rejoyce in the more eminent Qualifications of my Brethren, to do better Service in the Church of *Christ* than I can: Nor am I sensible, that I have said any thing either to magnify my self, or disparage Mr. P. A hectoring bragging Style, is what I very much dislike: nor can I perceive that I have us'd it. I leave it to the World to judge, whether I treat him or any Body with such *Scorn* and *Disdain* as he treats me, and every Person almost that he hath a *Controversy* with. How long Mr. P. may think fit to be concern'd with such a contemptible Adversary as I am, I can't tell. And in what a Posture things may be, when I come to put off my Harness, I can't say: But as I dare not think meanly of that *Holy Spirit*, who giveth to every Man severally as he will; and to whom I thankfully own my self indebted for every thing that I have, and am: So I hope I shall never boast of what I do, nor yet despair of any Assistance that may serve the Purposes of his Glory.

WHAT Mr. P. expects, p. 92. I should make very clear, viz. the Justice of my taking Possession of the *Pulpit* that once belong'd to him, though it be no Part of the Controversy that I have with him; yet, as I apprehend I can do it in very few Words, so I am willing to gratify him, though I go a little out of the way to do it. To this End, let me have leave to observe, that Mr. P. could not pretend any *Right* to the *Pulpit* of which he stands dispossest'd; but what the People gave him; and that under this suppos'd *Contract*, and *Reservation*, that they might resume it when they found it necessary, and settle it in such a one as they thought fit. When they settled it in Mr. P. it can't be thought to be with any other View,

than that he would serve them in the great, and concerning *Interests* of their *eternal Salvation*. And when He refus'd to do this, as they apprehended, who are the fittest and only *Judges* in this Case; they thought it a proper Time to assert that *Right*, which they neither did, nor could *innocently* resign; viz. the *Right* of chusing such other Ministers as they thought would serve them more faithfully. This *Right* of the People, (unless they are in a worse Condition as to their *Souls*, and *Salvation*; than as their *Bodies*, and *Estates*, which undoubtedly they are not) can no more be disputed; than their *Right* of chusing another *Lawyer*, or *Physician*, when they han't been serv'd by their former as they think they ought. 'Tis undeniable, that the *Generality* of the People of *Exon*, did not think themselves serv'd by Mr. P. and Colleague, as they should have been. They thought it dangerous, and very justly too, to intrust their *Souls* under their *Ministerial Conduct* any longer. And therefore, have unanimously chosen me to settle among them. 'Tis by their earnest, and unanimous Invitation that I, and my Colleague, have taken the Charge upon us, that once belong'd to Mr. P. and his. 'Tis to serve them, and what I take to be the *Cause* of *Christ*, and *Truth*, that I broke through many considerable Difficulties to come among them. Nor did the *Proprietors* do any thing, but what a vast Majority of the People, at least, I believe, five Parts in six, applauded and were thankful for. And seeing this vast Majority, with the Approbation of my Brethren, have call'd me to minister among them, and have given me the *Right* that once they did to Mr. P. I shall do my best to answer their Expectations: and don't see, that I have any more Reason to question my *Right*, than Mr. P. had to question his. They are the *Generality* of the Pec-

ple that once chose Mr. P. to be their Pastor, and have now chosen me. And if nothing else had stuck more with me, than their *Right* to have me, or some other Minister to exercise the *Pastoral Office* among them; I should have embrac'd their hearty, and unanimous Invitation a great deal sooner than I did.

I WONDER Mr. P. should not blush to say, that there was any thing in our *Postscript*, relating to the *Candidates*, contrary to *Fact*: For as to the *Candidates*, that are said in the *Postscript* to concur with us in our declar'd Sentiments concerning the Holy Trinity; Mr. P. I presume, can't be ignorant, that the thing is true. Two of them who were referr'd to have been since ordain'd, and given all the Satisfaction that could be desir'd. There are others that still preach as *Candidates* among us, with the *Approbation* of the *Assembly*, who could not, as I suppose he very well knows, be drawn into his *Scheme*: But if Mr. P. did not know, the *Editor* of the *Postscript* did, that there were *Candidates* that did thus concur with us, in what is said they did. And therefore Mr. P. can have no reason to charge me with the want of *plain Dealing*; and may with the same *Face*, and *Truth* say, that *Darkness is Light*, and *Light Darkness*, as say, that the matter is misrepresented. If there be any Misrepresentation, 'tis entirely his own. And what is it but an abusive Representation of the *Candidates*, to speak of them, as not concurring with us; when 'tis certain that several of them did, and that of those that were present at the *Assembly*? A like abusive Representation is it (to say nothing of Mr. P.'s Inconsistency, which notwithstanding his little *Gird* upon me, is plain enough) of the *Assembly*, and the *Editor* of the *Postscript*, to speak of us as delivering things contrary to *Fact*, when what we say is most true.

And

And no less scandalous, and abusive Representation is it of me, to speak of me as one that deals in *Detraction*, and *groundless Slander*, and speaking hardly of Persons that I know but little of. I challenge Mr. P. to clear himself, in this Instance, of the Charge he brings against me: and also all his *Emissaries* and *Agents*, from whom he hath taken up his Reproach, to make it good. If Mr. P. will take up such Reports, and deliver them to the World without *Examination*, as it is far from arguing the best Spirit; so whatever *Malice*, and *Falsehood* may be in them, (as there can't be a little of the latter in this Report) he makes them his own. Very sure I can be, that I have made my self no Enemies, by the Methods mention'd by Mr. P. And the most, I believe, of those that I have now, are either such through *Envy*; or because they could not bear, to have their *Errors*, or *Vices* spoken against, with that honest and open *Freedom*, that I always thought became a Minister of Christ.

NOR hath Mr. P. any more Reason to charge me with want of *plain Dealing*: For when I desir'd Liberty to subscribe the First Article, would his *Greatness*, or *Passion* have suffer'd him to tarry in the Assembly one Minute longer, he might, as I told him and his Friends when going out, have heard me declaring *frankly* and *honestly*, what my chief Intention was; viz. to clear my self, and those that might think fit to join with me, of the Suspicion of *Arianism*; and to discourage, if possible, the Growth of it. I can be very certain, that I had given no Occasion for any Suspicion, unless by endeavouring to vindicate Mr. P. whom I did not know so well formerly as I do now. I had spoken freely before, and that both *publickly* and *privately*, against the pernicious Notion; and yet, I was spoken of in many Places as one that had embrac'd

embrac'd it. And so were many of my Brethren, as innocent as my self, whether to make the Poison spread the faster, and farther, or for what other Reasons, I can't say. 'Twas but Justice therefore to *Truth*, and our selves, and a Duty that we ow'd to our abused *Saviour*, and *Sanctifier*, to do as my Brethren, and I did. And very sure I can be, that what I did, was upon no Wordly Views whatsoever. I can bless God, (I hope without any Vanity) that I had no Occasion to be influenc'd by such *mean Prospects*. And hitherto, my Conduct hath given no Occasion for such a *mean Insinuation*.

'Tis very strange, that Mr. P. should be ignorant, that the Care of the *Exeter Edition* of our Transactions was committed to me. If he did not know this, how is it, that in speaking of the *Postscript* and *Editor*, he should take such a particular Notice of me, the worthy Member who first propos'd the Subscription? * This seems to intimate, that he did know it, and that at parting, he had a Mind to vent a little of his *Temper* against me: But let this be as it will, I solemnly assure Mr. P. afresh, that I can recollect nothing, of my making any Application to any of the *Candidates*, or their Refusal. And yet, if it had been so, there would have been nothing false asserted in the *Postscript*; unless it was true, as 'tis not, that none of the *Candidates* did concur with us in our declar'd Sentiments concerning the *Trinity*: For though they might refuse to subscribe; yet they might concur in our Sentiments, which is the thing asserted in the *Postscript*. And this is what I could be very sure of; because I had it from two of them my self, and from Persons of unquestionable Veracity as to others.

* Remarks, p. 26.

As to *Gamaliel's* Advice, I have nothing to say against it, if not design'd by Mr. P. as a *Complement* on himself and Brethren. Yea, 'tis Advice, that I think, we have strictly follow'd as to Mr. P. and his Brethren; though we look upon them, as to their present *Notions*, to be quite the *Reverse* of the *Apostles*, and *first Christians*: Tho' we are strongly persuaded, that the *Counsel* that they have taken, and the *Work* that they have done, against our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier*, be entirely of *Men*, and will come to naught; yet in *Gamaliel's* Sense, we have *refrain'd* from them, and let them alone. And yet after all, I take the Case of *Luther*, and Mr. P. to be widely different, as different as the *Reformation* of the most *notorious Abuses*, is from the most *Infamous Corruption* of the *Faith*, and *Worship* of Christians: As different, as that of one that's violently persecuted, and in *Danger* of his Life for promoting *Truth*; and another that hath his full *Liberty* to propagate *Errors*: So that what might very pertinently be offer'd by one, may as impertinently be urg'd by the other.

AND whatever *Latitude* Mr. P. may give himself in speaking, I hope, he is not yet come so far, as to say that we have taken *Counsel* together, to slay him, and his Brethren; and least of all, for any extraordinary *Respect*, and *Honour*, that they of late have manifested to our *Blessed Saviour*: I can't but be very far from being of Mr. P.'s mind, p. 96. "That if they have suffer'd any *Disgrace*, *Reproach*, and *Insult* on the Account of their *Notions*, 'tis for the sake of Christ." How can it be for his sake, when such bold, and daring Attempts have been made by him and others, to strip him of his *Divinity*? and make him infinitely less in himself, and in the Sight of Mankind than really he is, and ought to be? 'Twould hardly be more

more odd in an *Atheist*, to say, that he was reproach'd for the sake of *God*; or in a *Deist* to say, that he was reproach'd for the sake of *Christianity*; than it is in an *Arian*, or *Socinian* to say, that they are reproach'd for the sake of *Christ*. 'Tis for want of a just Respect to him, that they are not thought, and spoken of as they were before. If Mr. P. and Brethren be displeas'd, that we have not now the same Regard to them that once we had, we must be content. Let them but think, and speak as honourably of our Saviour, and Sanctifier as once they did; and we shall soon think, and speak as honourably of them as ever: But till they do this, we must think of them just as they deserve. And though, I hope, we shall never treat them, as they have treated us; represent them as some of the worst of Men, for no other Reason, that I know, but our stedfast Adherence to Gospel Truths: though we shall never attempt to injure their Persons; yet they may be assur'd, we shan't be *Passive*, whilst they propagate their Errors: except in this, that we shall bear to be counted *Busy Bodies in other Mens Matters*, or any thing else; that we may secure, and advance the *Honour* of the *eternal Father, Son, and Spirit*; to whose Service we have been most solemnly devoted, and for whose *Honour*, as the one only living and true God, we can never suffer, or do enough.



Mr.



**Mr. P.'s REPLY, to Mr.
ENTY's Brief Animadver-
sions, &c. Consider'd.**

I APPREHEND, that one, and the *Prin-
cipal* of these false and malicious Stories
which Mr. P. says it was the Design of
their Paper to deny, is that which I
mention'd, *viz.* that he, and his Brethren are
Arians, or those that deny the true and *proper Di-
vinity* of our *Blessed Saviour*. I am as much at a
loss as ever, to understand, with what *Honesty*,
or *Conscience* Mr. P. and Brethren could deny this;
or how he can call this a false, and malicious
Story. Mr. P. owns p. 99. "That they don't
"bring any Proof that they are no *Arians*, but
"expect that their Word should be taken for
"that." But how can we take their Words for it;
when most, if not all of them, have, upon one
Occasion or other, deny'd the *eternal Power* and
Godhead of our Saviour? Mr. P. sure can't say,
but he hath abundantly deny'd it: We have suf-
ficient Proof, if needful, to be produc'd, that
others have done the same; which Mr. P.
we presume, can't be ignorant of: And there-
fore

fore to speak of us as "Revilers, Slanderers, as
 "practising cruel Methods, and as those that do
 "greatly abuse them, as p. 98, 99. because we re-
 "present them as *Arians*," is to practice the very
 thing that he condemns. There is a Sense, in which
 I had the Charity to hope they were not *Arians*:
 But tho' they mayn't hold (as *Arius* himself I be-
 lieve did not) all the *wild Opinions* of those that
 went by that Name: And tho' I believe it was ne-
 ver design'd by any that it shou'd be so thought;
 yet if they deny a thousand Times that they are
Arians, whilst they hold the *Distinctive Opinions*
 of that *Grand Corrupter* of the *Christian Faith*;
 we must expect something more than their Word,
 that they are no *Arians*, before we can believe it;
 especially, because we have the Word, at least of
 many of them, that they look upon our *Saviour*
 to be no other than a *God by Office*; and to be in-
 ferieur to the *Father*, in *Nature*, *Attributes*, and
Perfections; yea, to be the *voluntary Production*
 of the *Father*. This we know is, or was the Be-
 lief of most of the *Subscribers* of the Paper; and
 that which generally obtains among those who
 adhere to them. And if it was not, one might
 have expected more than a bare Denial, or to be
 told as in Mr. P.'s Answer, "That they are not
 "yet dispos'd to have me to chuse Expressions
 "for them; and that we are not to wonder that
 "they leave us thus in the dark; for that they
 "owe us not the Satisfaction we unreasonably de-
 "mand." For my own Part, I don't desire to
 chuse Words for Mr. P. or Brethren: But if they
 had as much dislik'd the *Notions* of *Arius*, as they
 seem to do the *Name*; they might have conde-
 scended so far, as to chuse Words for themselves.
 And if they were out of Humour with the *As-*
sembly, and would not gratify them: they might
 have declar'd their *Resentments* of our Proceedings;
 and

and yet have gone a little farther to satisfy the World, that they were wrong'd and injur'd, by being call'd *Arians*. If they thought it an Injury to their *Reputation*, and an Obstruction to their *Usefulness*, to be thus thought and spoken of; it looks like an odd sort of *Peevishness*, if they were able to clear their *Reputation*, that they should do nothing towards it, but what they knew would not be enough; purely to shew, how cross they can be to us. We don't desire that Mr. P. and Brethren should sacrifice their *Liberty* to satisfy us: but yet however, they might sacrifice their *Stiffness* to oblige themselves. 'Tis a *Jest* to talk of its being inconsistent with *Liberty*, or the highest *Regard* to *Scripture*, to open and explain the *Scriptures*. This Mr. P. might have done, or taken what other Method he thought fit, to satisfy the World that he was no *Arian*; and yet have still kept up the greatest Abhorrence of what he calls, p. 100. *Calumny, Slander, Imposition, and Inquisitory Proceedings*. And whatever he may pretend, p. 100, 101. "That he would have done no
 " more if suspected of *Popery*, than what he hath
 " done now he is suspected of *Arianism*; unless the
 " State had requir'd of him some Security of his
 " not entertaining any *Popish* Notions that might
 " be prejudicial to it;" yet it won't be so easy for any to believe this, that shall take Notice, what Pains he takes, and how particular he is in his *Postscript* to his *Remarks*, to purge himself from the Charge of being a *Jesuit, &c.* He was constrain'd, he says, by the Importunity of his Brethren, &c. to publish this *Postscript* to confute this Charge: and then gives us a long Detail of his *Birth, Education, Studies, Tutors, Travels, Ministry, Ordination, &c.* and this he doth, though few I am persuaded did believe the Story; and though the *State* did not require it. If he had at

all regarded the Importance of other Brethren; or been at half the Pains to have purg'd himself from the Charge of *Arianism*, which he knew most did believe; it would have been sufficient: But here, a bare Denial; and that too in Opposition to the Principles he endeavours to defend, must be thought sufficient. And really, 'tis shocking to me, that such a Denial as this should come from those, that are known to speak as most of the *Subscribers* of the Paper do: and especially, from one, that writes as Mr. P. doth; and can't go a Hair's breadth farther, if one may judge by his Writings, than *Arius* did; if quite so far. With what *Honesty*, or *Conscience* can such say, as p. 102. "That they
 " never taught any thing like *Arianism*; that they
 " have taken all proper Occasions to offer their
 " Reasons against it, from the Pulpit, though
 " not from the Press; and that they have sufficiently guarded against all Suspicions of *Arianism*
 " in their Publick Ministrations?" Mr. P. can't but know, that he, and his Friends were so far from this, that though they knew *Arianism* was getting Ground among them, they never attempted to suppress it. That they were so far from guarding against it in their *Publick Ministrations*; that the *Sermons* of some, and the *Silence* of others, gave the utmost Offence to many. And that at last, when he was under a Necessity to say something; he was so far from speaking against the new Notions, as what he dislik'd; that such as were in them, grew more *sanguine* and *open*, *bold* and *daring* than they were before.

MR. P. seems conscious to himself, that he had spoken too largely, in saying, that they had never taught any thing like *Arianism*, &c. and accordingly adds this *poor Salvo*, p. 102. "I mean, as *Arianism* was a new Doctrine, and differing from
 " what had been receiv'd before *Arius's* Time in
 the

the Church; or was what the Council of *Nice* oppos'd. This I take to be, just as if one charg'd with being a *Papist*, and teaching *Popery*, should constantly and strongly deny it; and when he could no longer withstand the Evidence that he had embrac'd, and taught the *distinctive Doctrines* of *Popery*, as *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c. should bring himself off thus, that he had not embrac'd, or taught *Popery*; as this was a *new Doctrine*, or differing from what had been receiv'd in the Church long before. There is no one but must condemn such a lame, equivocating, jesuitical *Shift* as this. When a Man says he is no *Papist*, and doth not teach *Popery*; every one understands hereby, that he doth not hold, or teach the *Distinctive Opinions* of *Popery*. And so, when a Man says he is no *Arian*, and doth not teach *Arianism*; every one understands, that he doth not hold, or teach the *Distinctive Opinions* of *Arius*. If any one holds, and teacheth these, he is an *Arian*, and teacheth *Arianism*; let *Arianism* be a new Doctrine, or old; or let it have been in the Church a longer, or less while. And if it was true in no other Sense, than according to this rare Interpretation, which Mr. P. hath kept in *Reserve* till now, that he and his Brethren were no *Arians*, or Teachers of *Arianism*; he hath made a great Noise to a fine Purpose. There is nothing but a Man may say, and come off by the Help of such *Reserves*. By the Help of these, he may be a *Papist*, and no *Papist*; a *Mahometan*, and no *Mahometan*; a *Jew*, and no *Jew*, &c. Mr. P. then is no *Arian*, or Teacher of *Arianism*, as this is a new Doctrine. However, if he can't venture to say, that neither he nor his Brethren have held, or taught the *distinctive Opinions* of *Arius*: If they can't say, that they have not been against the *Eternity*, and *Consubstantiality* of the *Son of God*; which was what the Council of

Nice

Nice endeavour'd to establish against *Arius* and his Followers: they have asserted, I think, what they can't maintain the Truth of; no not by Mr. P.'s *cunning Reservation*.

AND with as little *Truth*, or *Honesty*, I fear, can Mr. P. say, "That if their *Doxologies* have given " occasion to Suspicion, the *Nicene Fathers* themselves in all probability gave the same." For does not Mr. P. know, that if all the *Nicene Fathers* might not exactly use the same *Doxologies* that we do, that they did not however refuse to give Glory to the Holy Ghost: So that they can't be said to have given the same Suspicion concerning their *Faith* in the *Trinity*, that Mr. P. and his Friends have done. And especially when they appear'd with such a noble Zeal, to crush *Arianism* in its *Infancy*, as that which was destructive to *Christianity*. Quite contrary to the Conduct of the *Nicene Fathers*, the usual *Doxologies* were suppress'd by Mr. P. and several of his Brethren, to the unexpressible Grief of their Hearers. And what could they understand by this important Change in the Worship of God, but that they had shaken Hands with their *old Principles*? Mr. P. indeed would now insinuate, "as if St. *Basil* was the first Man that " brought our present *Doxologies* into use: And " that because of its Strangeness, he was forc'd to " Apologize, because the People were offended." Now thus much is true, that some did quarrel with him for using this *Doxology*; pretending, that it was an *Innovation*. But if Mr. P. had consider'd, by whom St. *Basil* was thus clamour'd, and what Apology he makes; he would never have taken Notice of this of St. *Basil*, unless to confirm Persons more in the Belief, that he is an *Arian* and *Macedonian* too. For the Persons that brought the Charge against St. *Basil*, were the *Aetians*, or *Eunomians*, whose Notions were, that the *Son* was altogether

together *unlike* the *Father*, in *Essence*, *Power* and *Will*. That the *Holy Ghost* was created by the *Son*, and had a precarious dependent Existence, as other created Beings have. They could not endure that equal Honour should be attributed to *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*: As far as I can perceive, there is little Difference between Mr. P.'s Notions and theirs. And what wonder can it be that they rais'd Objections against St. *Basil*, when he us'd the *Doxology* that had been us'd long before; tho' not by these *Eunomians*, yet in the Church of *Neocæsarea*, by *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, viz. *Glory to God, the Father and Son, with the Holy Ghost*? This *Doxology* was so contrary to the *Eunomian Faith*; which was, that the *Son* was to be honour'd only in Subordination to the *Father*; and the *Holy Ghost* inferior ^{as} to both; that nothing else could be expected, but that they should clamour about it: But they had no Reason to do so, as St. *Basil* in his Answer tells them, because of its *Novelty* and *Strangeness*, as Mr. P. supposeth. The *Apology* that he makes to those *arianizing Macedonians* was, that the *Doxology* he us'd, had been us'd before; not only by *Gregory* his Predecessor, but by *Africanus*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*; and that he with them, did follow the ancient *Custom* and *Rule* of the Church; who paid an equal Honour to *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as we do. He tells those *Aetians* moreover, that he did nothing but in perfect Agreement with *Firmilian*, *Melanius*, and the *Eastern Christians*; as also with the *Western Church*, from *Illyricum* to the *World's End*. And that this *Doxology* and *Practice* of his, was so far from being an *Innovation*; that what he did, had been done in the Churches from the very beginning of Christianity; and had been ever continued to his Time. And that it was a *regular Practice*, and ought for ever to be continued, he endeavours to prove; as by other Arguments, so
from

from the *baptismal Form*; where he thought that equal Honour was ascrib'd unto them. And if this Testimony of St. *Basil* be true, that the common *Doxology*, (which Mr. P. would not suffer to be us'd by his People) had been us'd by the Church in its publick Devotions from the beginning: as also in *occasional Ejaculations*; and that by immemorial Custom: Then I think that Mr. P. and Brethren, by disusing this *Doxology*, and substituting others in its Room; did but give too just Occasion of Suspicion, that they were become *Favourers* of the *Arian* and *Macedonian Notions*.

MR. P. and Brethren could not well be ignorant, that they were charg'd with *Macedonianism*, as well as *Arianism*: and therefore it looks odd, that they should say only this concerning their Faith in the *Holy Ghost*; that they believe all that the Scripture says of him: This Mr. P. says, p. 101. "is Faith enough for a Christian or Minister." This I readily allow, if it was true: But I am far from thinking, that such as deny him to be *God*, and say that he is inferior to the *Son*, as well as the *Father*; and is a Being that deserves no Glory; do believe all that the Scripture says of him, or enough for either *Minister* or *Christian*. 'Tis known to every Body, that these are Mr. P.'s Notions: And as he is *prime Manager* in most other Affairs; so I might easily be led to suppose, that he was *chief Director* in this; which hath such a *Tang* of his *Artifice* and *Notions* in it. And if the Paper was not drawn by him, 'twas very well known by those that drew it, what would please their *Patron*, and what not. Nor can I yet think, but 'twas in a great Measure to humour him, that they speak as they do of the *Holy Ghost*.

I wonder how Mr. P. can venture to say, as p. 102. "The next Sentence," (i. e. the Sentence that relates to the subscribing the first Ar-

ticle of the Church of *England*; which the *London* Ministers say they could have subscrib'd')
 "We could have us'd: provided it be under-
 stood, we thought for our selves, that such
 Subscriptions could not be made with a safe
 Conscience, not upon the Account of Truth, but
 Liberty." 'Tis shocking, that Mr. *P.* can insinuate, that they could subscribe the *first Article* of the Church, if only *Truth* and not *Liberty* was concern'd. For don't they hold the Doctrine therein contain'd, to be both absurd and false? Hath not Mr. *P.* in this, and other Performances, attempted to prove that 'tis not true? How then can he, (if Truth was only concern'd) subscribe that as Truth, which he holds to be false? If Mr. *P.*'s, or his Friends Consciences, can allow them to subscribe any thing, whether true or false, where Liberty is not concern'd, (as they must if they can subscribe the *first Article*;) I can't see by what Rule they govern their Consciences. The Scriptures can't be the Rule of their *Conduct* in this Case, whatever they be of their *Faith*. And after what Manner they own *Christ* for their *Master*, (when they can subscribe any thing, whether true or false, if Liberty be not concern'd) I don't understand. Nor can I better understand how 'tis contrary to *Liberty*, to subscribe what I have no Objection against, on the Account of its Truth. 'Tis the *Falshood* of things, that should be the *grand Objection* against subscribing: 'Tis on this Account, that we are exempted from subscribing some of the thirty nine Articles by the *Toleration*. We are not fully satisfied in the Truth of those that we except against; and therefore 'tis not expected of us: And by this Provision, we always thought our *Liberty* in this Respect, sufficiently secur'd. And it can't be, but *Liberty* must be safe, where there is no *Compulsion*;
 F f. which

which in Matters of *Conscience*, we shall always plead against, with as much *Warmth* and *Zeal* as Mr. P. can: Nor can I see but we can do it with as good a *Grace*, as those who make the greatest *Noise* about *Liberty*; but manifest little or no Concern about *Faith* and *Truth*.

MR. P. I think, hath little Reason to wish, as p. 103. that others would be as indifferent as himself about the *Sense* of Scripture, and particularly that of the *baptismal Form*. The *Papists* use the same Words, as to the other Sacrament, that we do, and yet, by taking them in a wrong *Sense*, fall into *Idolatry*. The Danger I take to be equally great, in Reference to *Baptism*. Nor can I think, but those do most notoriously corrupt the Worship of *Christians*, and mix *Idolatry* with it, who baptize in the Name of *God* and *Creatures*: So that, if it be nothing to Mr. P. 'tis very material to me, in what *Sense* we take the *baptismal Form*. 'Tis by the *Sense* that we put upon it, that we act regularly or not, in this solemn Affair. And when the *Sense* of Scripture is so little regarded, 'tis no wonder if the *Sound* be disregarded too in a little Time.

MR. P. can't say, but we ever manifested much Pleasure in the Reputation and Usefulness of him and his Brethren; and if these be less now than formerly, they have no Reason to charge it upon any but themselves. How useful Mr. P. hath been in *Exon*, I can't say: But if ever he was useful, 'twas when he talk'd in such Language about our Saviour's *Divinity*, &c. as others did. 'Tis Mr. P.'s Business to account for the Honesty of it, that he should, before he came to *Exon*, have his present Notions; and yet use the same Expressions as to our Saviour's *Godhead*, that the *Orthodox* do. 'Twas a Persuasion in the People that he meant as he spake, that

that made him acceptable; and useful also, if he was so: But when they understood that they had been put off with Words without any Meaning; they justly abhor'd the *Fraud and Imposition*; and Mr. P.'s Usefulness was soon at an end.

IF Mr. P. was not treated with the usual Respect when he had discover'd his Notions, he may thank his Notions for the Alteration: Before this Discovery, whatever it might be afterwards, he had the least Reason of any Man to say, that he was treated with *Scorn and Contempt*: I rather think, that he was regarded not only in a Proportion to his Worth, but much above it; and that by others as well as himself: and that this hath done him no Kindness. He hath not magnified himself, more than he was magnified by others: And therefore, I don't know, seeing he is not disregarded now on the Account of his Sense and Learning; what Occasion there was, (unless to gratify a Humour, which most knew was too predominant before) to mention such a Train of famous *Tutors*, as those that had the Care of his Education: Nor to mention, how acceptable he was to the famous *Reland*, lately dead, to the incredible Loss of Learning: Nor to take Notice, that he frequented the famous *Bodleian Library*: What Satisfaction his Brethren at *London* took in his being at *Cambridge*; because they found he was not the most disagreeable Person to the *Gentlemen* of the *Uninversity*, &c. I am apt to think, Mr. P. would reckon these things vain in another Man, when there was no Necessity at all to mention them. Yea, the *senseless Story* it self, that he was a *Jesuit*, made this the more unnecessary; seeing those are look'd upon by all, to be cunning, crafty, designing Men; and to have at least an equal Share of *Sense and Learning*, whatever they

have of *Honesty*, with other Persons. Nor does it seem to be altogether so free from *Vanity*, as Mr. *P.* would represent it, that he speaks of himself as beholding to none for his Education. There have been Persons of the greatest Worth that have: Nor is it a Disparagement to any to have been upon a *Fund Book*, nor to be descended from such as could not of themselves afford the most generous Education; as the great A. B. *Tillotson* was not ashamed to own he was. ~~And~~ I would have been very unreasonable in any, to expect a more than ordinary Submission from him upon this Account. And so it would, to have expected the like from Mr. *P.* or any Body else; tho' much more meanly descended than this great Man. What therefore he should mention these things for, and upbraid others as the *Jews* of old, our Saviour and his Apostles, with the Meanness of their Circumstances, unless to gratify his own Vanity, I can't understand: However, shall be glad if his own Conscience can satisfy him that 'tis not so.

To conclude then: I have been very particular, in considering every thing that Mr. *P.* hath offer'd, that he might have no Occasion to say, that I neglected him. By this Means, I have drawn my Answer into a greater Length than I intended, or was absolutely needful. That it did not, however, appear in the World sooner; must be imputed in a great Measure, to an unavoidable *Division* of much of my Time between *Plymouth* and *Exon*; where my late Settlement hath also swallow'd up a great deal more. Though it comes a little too late, I hope there may be something in it that may be of Service, to remove some unaccountable Prejudices against our *Assembly*; as also to establish Persons in the *Faith* of the Gospel. And if any thing I have said may be of any Use to recover others,

I shall greatly rejoice. If I had writ only for *Scholars*, I should probably have us'd fewer Words: But the meanest Christian, hath a most important Interest at *Stake* in the present Debates about the *Trinity*. And therefore, as I have endeavour'd to use none but fair Arguments; so, I hope, Mr. P. or at least the World will excuse me, that I have not us'd fewer Words.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAGE 13. l. 6. dele *differing*. p. 35. l. 12. read *have*. ib. l. 17. r. *Language*. p. 51. l. 22. for *more* r. *here*. p. 59. l. 11. for *xxii*. r. 38. p. 100. l. 12. r. *Apostles*. ib. l. 15. r. *suggest*. p. 109. l. 20. for *then* r. *there*. p. 145. l. 25. for *Expression* r. *Notion*. p. 158. l. ult. r. *God that*. Besides some other literal Mistakes.

Publisch'd by the same AUTHOR.

THE Ministry secur'd from Contempt: A Sermon preach'd at *Exon*, Sept. 10th, 1707. before an Assembly of the united Ministers of *Devon* and *Cornwal*. Price 6 d.

A Defence of the Proceedings of the late Assembly at *Exon*, [May 5th and 6th 1719.] being a Reply to Mr. *Peirce's* Remarks on those Proceedings. To which are added, some brief Animadversions on a Paper subscrib'd by Mr. *Peirce*, &c. And also a short Postscript, containing some Remarks on a late Pamphlet of Mr. *George Jacomb*. Price 1 s.



20 SE 62

Lately Printed for JOHN CLARK.

THE Doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity Stated and Defended: By some *London* Ministers. [The Introduction: By the Reverend Mr. TONG. Chap. I. By the Reverend Mr. ROBINSON. Chap. II. By the Reverend Mr. SMITH. Chap. III. By the Reverend Mr. REYNOLDS.] The Second Edition. Price 1s. 6d.

A Vindication of the true Deity of our blessed Saviour: In Answer to Mr. *Emlyn*. By the Reverend Mr. JOSEPH BOYSE of *Dublin*. The third Edition. Price Bound 2s.

The Seventh Edition of, Some plain and short Arguments from Scripture, proving the Lord Jesus Christ to be the supreme God, or one and the same God with the Father, notwithstanding his acknowledged Inferiority to the Father, with Respect to his human Nature and Mediatorship. Price 2d. or 12s. a Hundred.

A calm Defence of the Deity of Jesus Christ, With Remarks on a Letter to a Dissenter at *Exeter*. By the Reverend Mr. JOHN MOOR of *Tiverton*. The second Edition. Price 6d.

A brief Collection of Scripture Arguments, in Defence of the true, proper and supreme Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By a private Christian in the Country. Recommended by the Reverend Mr. B. ROBINSON, Minister in *London*. Price 1s.

Arius detected and confuted: Or, a short and familiar Direction for plain Christians, that love the Lord Jesus Christ, and hearken to his Voice, how to understand the Language of the Disciples of *Arius*.

Arias, that they may not by their good Words, and fair Speeches, be drawn to worship two Gods, or rather, one God and a Creature, contrary to many plain and exprefs Texts of holy Scripture. The second Edition. To which is added, an Appendix in Answer to two Pamphlets publish'd against it, by the Author of *The Letter to a Dissenter in Exon*. Price 6d.

The Psalms of *David*, imitated in the Language of the New Testament, and apply'd to the Christian State and Worship. By the Reverend Mr. ISAAC WATTS. The Second Edition. Price 1s. 6d.

A Description of the Four last Things, *viz.* Death, Judgment, Heaven and Hell, in Blank Verse. The Second Edition. To which is added three Spectators, printed in the Year 1715, on the following Subjects, *viz.* The Tombs in *Westminster-Abbey*; The Christian's Felicity; The Joys of Eternity: And also, A Meditation on the Works of Creation, never before printed. By the same Author. Price 1s. 6d.

In the PRESS.

A Compleat Collection of the Sermons of the Reverend and Learned JOHN OWEN, D. D. formerly Published, with an Addition of many others never before Printed: Also, several valuable Tracts, most of which are now first Published from Manuscripts, and the rest such as were very scarce. To which will be added, his *Latin* Oration whilst Vice-Chancellor of *Oxford*, taken from his own Copies: And to the Whole will be prefix'd, Memoirs of his Life, with a Catalogue of all his Works, and some original Letters to particular Friends. In *Folio*.

Sermons.

Sermons upon several Practical Subjects: With Hymns suitable to each. By the Reverend Mr. ISAAC WATTS, 12^o. Price 2 s. 6 d.

A Memorial of the Reformation, chiefly in *England*, and of *Britain's* Deliverances from Popery and Arbitrary Power since that Time, to the present Year, 1720. Containing the State of the Reformation under K. *Henry VIIIth*, K. *Edward VIth*, and Q. *Elizabeth*; with the Principles and Endeavours of Those who have from Time to Time stood for a further Reformation, as a short History of Non-conformity: A particular Relation of all the Plots and Conspiracies of Papists and others against the Reformation, and Civil Liberties of the Land: Some short Memoirs of the Civil War in K. *Charles Ist*'s Time; and a distinct Answer to the Question, *Who cut off the King's Head?* By the Reverend Mr. B. BENNET. The Second Edition, with Additions.

The Holy Spirit a Divine Person: Or, the Doctrine of his Godhead represented, as evident and important, in several Practical Sermons on I Cor. xii. 11. By the Reverend Mr. JOHN GUISE, 8^{vo}.

Rational and Christian Principles, the best Rules of Conduct: With an Appendix in Vindication of the Author. By the Reverend Mr. N. BILLINGSLEY. Price 1 s.

The Extent of the Primitive Churches inquired into; and some Reasons to prove that they were Congregations. With a Table of all the Places in the New Testament, where the Word Church is used, digested under proper Heads. Pr. 1 s.

A Reply to Dr. *Waterland's* Remarks, on a Pamphlet intituled, *The Unity of God not inconsistent with the Divinity of Christ*. By the Author of *the Unity*, &c. Price 1 s.

